

BACONIANA

VOL. XXXI.

No. 123.

April 1947

EDITORIAL NOTES

"SWEET ARE THE USES OF ADVERTISEMENT!" A well-known brand of pills has been advertised in the Press accompanied by a portrait of Francis Bacon with the quotation, "A healthy body is the guest-chamber of the soul." We doubt if Bacon would have approved of the use to which he has been put. He believed in dieting rather than medicine. "I commend rather some diet for certain seasons than frequent use of physic."

* * *

SIR JOHN CONSTABLE. Bacon dedicated the 1612 edition of the Essays to his brother-in-law, Sir John Constable. Does any reader know whether he was related to Henry Constable, the poet who wrote the *Diana* sonnets (1594)? Henry Constable was the son of Sir Robert Constable of Newark. He corresponded with Anthony Bacon, and tried to get employment with Essex through him.

* * *

DOES ANY READER KNOW—the source of a quotation on the Northumberland Manuscript:

"Laden with grief and oppression of heart"
There is beauty and rhythm in this. It is probably from some play or poem. It is not in the Bible.

In *Richard II* (I, iv) we have "Heart . . oppression . . grief" within three lines:

And for my heart disdained that my tongue
Should so profane the word that taught me craft
To counterfeit oppression of such grief
That words seemed buried in my sorrow's grave, &c.

* * *

THE STRATFORD IDOL IS CRACKING. On 25th January, Professor Allardyce Nicoll delivered the presidential address to The Shakespeare Club at Stratford-on-Avon and was astonishingly candid about the false ideas, superstition and traditions which constitute the ingredients for padding out what is called "A Life of Shakespeare."

From the long report in *The Stratford-on-Avon Herald* of 31st January, we observe that he went so far as to say:

"The assumption was that William Shakespeare of Strat-

ford-upon-Avon wrote the plays that appeared in the First Folio, and he saw no way of disproving it."

Never before has an orthodox professor of such eminence dared to admit that the claims of the Stratford man rested upon an "assumption," though we remember how Professor J. Dover Wilson, in *The Essential Shakespeare* 'dropped a brick' with this:

"To credit the authorship of *Love's Labour's Lost* to a butcher boy who left school at thirteen, and whose education was only what a little provincial borough could provide, is to invite one to believe in miracles, or to disbelieve in the man of Stratford."

And as nobody does believe in miracles, there is no alternative but to "disbelieve."

Professor Allardyce had to confess that:

We do not know where he was born, or when.

We know nothing of his boyhood.

We do not know whether he attended school.

There is not "the slightest scrap of evidence" to support the deer-stealing legend.

We are not certain that he married Anne Hathaway.

We do not know where she lived.

He was only a moderately successful actor.

There are no "intimate pictures" of him by any friend or associate.

As for gossip and tradition, "people must be on their guard before accepting any of the stories that had come down concerning Shakespeare."

The Stratford idol is crumbling fast, and the 'high priests' are helping to shatter it. It only remains for the professors to step out of the ruins and join the Baconians.

* * *

H. J. MASSINGHAM AGAIN. In our "Editorial" of January, we commented upon Mr. H. J. Massingham's delusions about Shakespeare's alleged intimacy with the countryside, and his natural history. This arose from certain remarks in his book, *Where Man Belongs*. He returns to the subject in *Country Life* of 14th February. We agree that Shakespeare "enjoyed country sights and sounds," but so does every lover of beauty. This does not, however, mean that he had any technical knowledge about what he saw or heard. We can enjoy the songs of birds without being able to distinguish between a thrush and a blackbird. We can be profoundly moved by an opera, symphony or concerto without being an expert on any instrument or even having the slightest knowledge of harmony and counterpoint. Although he does not mention Bacon, it seems obvious that Mr. Massingham wants to convince his readers that only a countryman could have written the plays, and that he classes Bacon

as a townsman. But Bacon probably spent just as much of his time in the country as he did in London, which was then no larger than many a present-day country town.

The examples he gives to support his argument are not impressive. He quotes Enobarbus in *Antony and Cleopatra*:

The breeze upon her, like a cow in June,
Hoists sail and flies.

"Breeze," he claims, is Warwickshire. No doubt it was as it was in general use for what we now call the gad-fly. It is found in Chaucer as early as 1380 (*Balade*)—"a breeze on wylde horsse." It is found frequently up to Shakespeare's time. Spenser has it in the F.Q. vi. 1, 24:

As doth a steer . . . with his long tail
The breezes brush away.

Were not Chaucer and Spenser Londoners? His other quotation is from *The Tempest* (IV, 1):

The banks with pioned and twilled brims,
Which spongy April at thy hest betrimms,
To make cold nymphs chaste crowns.

These lines occur in the masque, and are spoken by Iris.

"Pioned," claims Mr. Massingham, is Warwickshire for lined with wild orchises—"pionies" being, as he alleges, the marsh or spotted orchis. Mr. Massingham is just as entitled to make a guess as to the meaning as anybody else, for all the commentators have failed to agree. Personally I prefer the interpretation of "pioned" meaning "dug out" or "channelled." "Pioner" was a favourite word with Bacon and Shakespeare for a digger or sapper. "Twilled brims" is generally considered to mean banks with ridges of reed, rush or sedge. "Twilled" for "having ridges" is traced back in the N.E.D. to as early a date as 1423. It is generally used in connection with weaving. "Brim" for the water's edge can be quoted from 1398 to its use at the present time. In Dorset they call the sand on the shore "brim sand."

There is also the question to be considered as to whether the masque was, indeed, written by Shakespeare. The lines are lacking in poetry; they are cumbersome and the language exceedingly involved. I confess that I find it most difficult to gather what the speeches of the three goddesses mean. Shakespeare, certainly, never wrote anything else like them, and for this we should be thankful.

What Mr. Massingham gives as examples of Shakespeare's "country terms" are unfortunate as not only were they not peculiar to Warwickshire, but were general over the whole country. These are "reeds" for thatch and "lodged" for laid corn. The former only occurs once in the meaning of "thatch" (*Tempest*, v, 1), whereas "thatch" or "thatched" is to be found five times. It did not need a countryman to know that reeds were used for thatching.

As for "lodged" applied to corn or grass beaten down by wind or rain (see *Rich. II*, iii, 3) &c. This is found from the time of Chaucer (who was a Londoner) onward, and it has not become archaic, nor was it ever peculiar to any one county or district. It is difficult to imagine what alternative word there could have been. George Sandys could not be described as a countryman, and when he wrote in his translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, "The Corne is lodged; the husbandmen despair," he had been a traveller nearly all his life.

Mr. Massingham has not made one single point which proves Shakespeare to have been country born. On the contrary the evidence supplied by the plays and poems shows that he was not very intimate with, nor particularly attracted to, the lives of rustics, their occupations or their confines.

It is not for the sake of advancing knowledge that Mr. Massingham seeks to prove the impossible. Articles of this kind are prompted solely by the advance of Baconians against the last pockets of Stratfordian resistance.

* * *

LIFTING THE BARRICADE. The astounding news reaches us that at the Stratford Festival two unorthodox Shakespeareans have been invited to express their views upon the authorship of the plays and poems. On May 20th, Mr. Percy Allen of the Oxfordians will give a lecture from his angle, and will be followed next day by Mr. Alfred Dodd who will speak on behalf of the Baconians. On the following day the two champions will meet in a Debate, on 22nd. We would urge members who have the time and opportunity to attend, to make the journey. Not only will their support be valuable but, we can assure them, that they will find the lectures and discussions both interesting and entertaining. The time for each meeting is 11 a.m., admission is.

* * *

BACON'S BIRTHDAY. On January 22nd, a good gathering of Members was present at a *Conversazione* and tea at The United Nursing Services Club, 34, Cavendish Square, W.I. This was a pleasant and informal meeting, and we were glad to see the President, Sir Kenneth Murchison who was accompanied by Lady Murchison. The President and Miss M. Sennett addressed those present.

LET IT BE INQUIRED

How came it about that two separate dates are assigned to Easter Sunday in 1626, both by persons of repute? Thomas Herbert in his "Relation of some years Travel begun anno 1626 & published first in 1634 and again in 1638, states—"Upon Good Friday we tooke ship at Dover, having six large & wel-manned ships along with us. Next day we coasted by the Ile of Wight . . . & upon Easter day being the five and twentieth of March, we lost sight of the Lizard."

The other record of Easter Sunday is that given by Dr. Wm. Rawley in the short sketch he wrote on Bacon's life prefixed to *The Resuscitatio* published in 1657. Here Rawley writes:—"He (Bacon) died on the 9th day of Aprill in the year 1626 in the early morning of the day then celebrated for Our Saviour's Resurrection, in the sixtieth year of his age." What is the explanation of this discrepancy? The New Style which differed by ten days from the Old Style had not yet been adopted in England.

SOME SIDELIGHTS.

"There is something about Bacon's diction, his quaintness of expression and his power of illustration, which lays hold of the mind, and lodges itself in the memory in a way which we hardly find paralleled in any other author, except it be Shakespeare."

Professor Fowler, (*Introduction to Bacon's Novum Organum*).

"That big poetical spirit which gleams out of every page of his philosophy."

Charles Knight on Bacon.

"That Shakespeare possessed an altogether extraordinary knowledge of law, of medicine, of science, of philosophy, of languages, of everything in short which would be impossible for an uneducated man, whatever his genius as a poet might be, has long seemed to me an insoluble mystery."

Sir Lewis Morris. M.A. (1833-1907).

(Author and Barrister of Lincoln's Inn; Deputy-Chancellor of the University of Wales; Vice-President University College, Aberystwyth).

"I regard the publication of controversial books as a specially important part of a general publisher's function. What better way is there of securing deliberate and thorough investigation of new ideas and unpopular opinions? The enemy of subversive thought is not suppression but publication. Truth has no need to fear the light of day; fallacies wither under it. The unpopular views of to-day are the commonplaces of tomorrow, and in any case, the wise man wants to hear both sides of every question. Publication winnows the grain of truth from the chaff of superstition, and it is the publisher's duty to help this process by maintaining an open forum."

Sir Stanley Unwin (*The Truth about Publishing*, Geo. Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1946, p. 332.)

R.L.E.

CURRENT EVENTS

ON February 14th, Mr. Alfred Dodd delivered an address to some 300 men and women students of Risley Training College, Culcheth near Warrington. The Principal, Mr. Clarke, occupied the chair.

The speaker pointed out the necessity for everyone—especially students—maintaining an open mind on all the problems that affect mankind, to reject nothing on *a priori* grounds and to keep throughout life one's position plastic in order to assimilate new ideas and new knowledge that might be met from many quarters of the horizon. To maintain an absolutely fixed opinion on any subject was to invite the complaint known as *arterio sclerosis*. . a hardening of the mental arteries; before they were aware of it they would be dead from the neck up. They should resolutely refuse to be drawn into and swallowed up by the mass-mind or swept along by the common current of popular opinion, very often ignorant and uninformed. Never forget that it is the dead fish that floats down the stream and that it takes a live one to swim against it. Let them, then, be live wires—keen, alert and open to the reception of new truth no matter how strange it might appear at first sight.

To literary students in particular this advice was extremely necessary for, generally speaking, men and women had not the slightest idea that the greatest literary problem confronting the world was the problem of "Shake-speare," the question of his identity and his connection with the Plays. In fact, the great majority had been cradled in a set of beliefs that were largely traditional and were not at all factual. We drank in with our mother's milk that the Actor of Stratford was the Author of the Plays and therefore it was difficult to rid ourselves from bias, prejudice and prepossessions. The real point at issue was something far bigger than an empty quarrel between textualists and their interpretations. It was whether we as a nation had acted justly towards the greatest of our sons—the Immortal Bard. Literature was Life; it was the revaluation of a life, the Life of a Man, in which the speaker sought to interest his auditors, and not a textual controversy.

Mr. Dodd then pointed out the mystery surrounding the Shake-speare Plays—their creation and publication. The mystery had not been solved although myriads of academic researchers for upwards of three hundred years had ransacked the archives at Stratford and London to trace the Author. One thing had been abundantly proved—that Shaksper the Actor was not Shake-speare the Author. The speaker then gave a rapid sketch of the Life of the Actor showing how impossible it was for such an illiterate to have written such monu-

mental works of art and to have amassed a fortune out of his Plays within ten years from leaving Stratford as an ignorant rustic. The true Author of the Plays, Mr. Dodd asserted, was Francis Bacon, and his personality was shown quite clearly in Shake-speare's Sonnets. These were lyrical and not dramatic utterances. The Author spoke in his own person and the Sonnets formed a diary from youth to old age.

Several times the lecture was punctuated by laughter and applause. Questions were asked by the students and Mr. Dodd's answers were greeted with much feeling and even enthusiasm. The Principal expressed his appreciation of the learned manner in which the case had been presented.

As a sequel, a mock trial was arranged about a month later, Francis Bacon being indicted for using Shaksper as a Mask—with Judge, Counsel and witnesses; and the students had a rollicking time listening to the arguments of the prosecutor and the defending Counsel whose role was ably sustained by Mr. Eric Webb, who was responsible for Mr. Dodd visiting the College.

BACON'S CIPHER HISTORY DEBATED AT TORQUAY.

MR. COMYNS BEAUMONT, on March 7th, gave an address to the members of the South Devon Literary and Debating Society on the subject of "The Secret History of Queen Elizabeth, by her son Francis Bacon." There was a large attendance and in the absence of the President, Mr. Cyril Maude, through a chill, the chair was taken by Mr. J. R. Whincop. The audience, few of whom had ever heard of the ciphers, were greatly interested in hearing the inside story.

The speaker began by telling his audience that whilst they had heard others claim that Bacon was the author of the Shakespeare plays, basing their arguments upon the literary, philosophical, and other resemblances to his known work, he proposed to explain the ciphers which were concealed in the Shakespeare plays, in other works of the period, in his own acknowledged works, and especially, he stressed, in the first Shakespeare Folio of 1623, published seven years after Mr. Shaksper of Stratford-on-Avon had departed this life, containing fifteen plays never before published. Describing at some length how first Dr. Orville W. Owen, and then Mrs. Gallup, discovered the clues to the Word and Biliteral ciphers respectively, Mr. Beaumont gave details from the cipher accounts of how, when young Francis, in his sixteenth year, suddenly learnt from the Queen's own lips during a *fracas* at Court, that she was his mother, he ~~was~~ immediately afterwards sent abroad to the Court of Henri III

of France in the charge of Sir Amyas Paulet, appointed an ambassador specially for that purpose. There he remained for two and a half years, having been previously warned on peril of his life that he must never reveal the fact and must call himself Bacon, son of the Lord Keeper Sir N. Bacon and of his wife, Anne. He described how Francis learnt that, although born in wedlock, his father being the Earl of Leicester, the marriage could never be publicly avowed because behind it lurked the story of a hideous crime, the murder of Amy Robsart, the young wife of Lord Robert Dudley as he was in 1560, a murder which created such a scandal that had it leaked out the Queen's own position would have been critical. Four months after Amy's death Francis was born, carried away surreptitiously by Lady Bacon to her own house, and brought up by her as her son. All this was perfectly well known, said the speaker, to Elizabeth's leading ministers, including Burleigh, and hushed up, whilst she posed as the "Virgin Queen" and used it cleverly for diplomatic and political ends.

Francis Bacon was thereby deprived of his just status as Prince of Wales, and Heir to the Tudor throne, but he dared not utter a word all his lifetime. His life was in constant danger from spies, and he had, moreover, to incur the dislike if not active hatred of the Queen, who blamed him for her own folly. His only recourse was to write a secret history of his own times in cipher, conceal it in books and plays, and use certain emblems and other devices to attract the attention to future generations. After criticising the remarkable errors and misprints in the Folio of 1623, which he explained were all related to the ciphers, Mr. Beaumont finally claimed that Bacon's cipher history threw an entirely new light on many unaccountable events in Elizabeth's reign, including the uprising of Essex, who was also her son, and who had designs on the succession.

A lively debate followed. Mr. Beaumont, questioned more directly about the Biliteral Cipher, gave some examples and mentioned that many well-known cryptologists who had supported it, including the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Henry Seymour, in England, Col. Fabyan, a well-known American who instituted a bureau expressly to check up on Mrs. Gallup, and in France Gen. Cartier, former Chief of the Military Cipher Service, who has written articles and books on the subject. A warm vote of thanks concluded the proceedings.

CONVERSAZIONE

ON Wednesday, 22nd January, 1947, the Bacon Society held a Conversazione at 34, Cavendish Square, London, W.1. (The United Nursing Services Club). Forty-seven members and visitors were present.

This was the first occasion for seven years that the Society was able to have a social function on the anniversary of Francis Bacon's birth.

The guests were received by Sir Kenneth Murchison (President of the Society) and Lady Murchison. While members greeted their friends, visitors had an opportunity of meeting some of the members of the Council and making new acquaintances. Tea was served at 4-30.

After tea Sir Kenneth Murchison addressed the meeting, giving welcome to all present, and speaking of the work of the Society and the importance of the evidence for the belief that the Plays of Shakespeare were written by Sir Francis Bacon. This belief is gaining acceptance not only in England but in many countries. We have members and fellow-students in U.S.A., Canada, Australia and New Zealand, in India and Turkey. Forms of application for membership were available and books and pamphlets were on sale.

After a short interval Miss M. Sennett (chairman of the Council) spoke. This is, she said, a birthday party and a festive occasion. Let us play games as children do on birthdays. Francis Bacon has already chosen the first game for us: an old favourite, *Hide and Seek*.

Here are his own words: "Salomon the King, although he excelled in the glory of treasure and magnificent buildings, of shipping and navigation, of service and attendance, of fame and renown, and the like, yet he maketh no claim to any of these glories, but only to the glory of inquisition of truth, for so he saith expressly, 'the glory of God is to conceal a thing, but the glory of the king is to find it out;' as if, according to the innocent play of children, the Divine Majesty took delight to hide his works, to the end to have them found out; and as if kings could not attain a greater honour than to be God's playfellows in that game. . . ." And he urges us to seek not alone a knowledge that is superficial, but the wisdom and understanding which look deeply below the surface, ever seeking that which is hidden . . . "as the scriptures do often invite us to consider and magnify the great and wonderful works of God, so if we should rest only in the contemplation of the exterior of them as they first offer themselves to our senses, we should do a like injury unto the Majesty of God, as if we should judge or construe of the store of some excellent jeweller, by that only which is set out toward the street in his shop."

Bacon's life was wholly dedicated to this "Inquisition of Truth," wherein, in spite of (perhaps because of) the many difficulties of his earthly life he knew himself to be God's Playfellow. Later in life he wrote, "I have sought Thee in the courts, fields and gardens, but I have found Thee in Thy Temples." And as, in the innocent play of children, the one who finds is next in turn to be hidden, so Bacon is hidden in his works, where we may find him if we truly seek him, rejoicing to be his play-fellows.

As a help towards the search, let us think a little of another popular game, and try a Cross-Word Puzzle. There is a significance in this pastime, more than meets the eye.

In *The Times Literary Supplement* of the 3rd January 1942, in a review of "The Star-lit Dome," by Prof. Wilson Knight, the writer says, "One of the clearest, and as we now see most deathly characteristics of the modern age is its loss of a true polarity between the temporal and the eternal. Human experience should be both vertical and horizontal. It should be related vertically to a Spiritual plane at once high and deep, or, to use the familiar symbols, to heaven and hell. Horizontally, it should be a movement through time . . . Prof. Knight discovers not merely a symbolical pattern but a universal panorama of existence in which the drama of the interplay of eternity and time is wonderfully imaged . . ."

To the Christian student, versed in the teaching of the Gospel parables, there is nothing new in this concept of the union of the vertical and the horizontal; it is the Eternal Cross, the explanation and reconciliation of Life and death. It is therefore not surprising if we find the language of symbolism used by the greatest of poets. To those who know Bacon's interest in this method of instruction, and who are convinced that the Shake-Speare plays are his work, the only surprising thing is that we have not earlier sought for his hidden and spiritual teachings. I do not mean only that we should search for cipher stories, though these are one way to the truths behind the shop window; but, exciting and stimulating as such researches are, they are still on the horizontal plane, and may reveal, even if they are correctly deciphered, no more than new facts of history and biography. I would suggest to the members of this Society that some at least, should turn their searching eyes to the Vertical aspects of the great storehouse of Jewels which lie securely locked up behind the splendour of Shake-speare's window display. He has many things "under the counter" for his friends! Surely none of us will be like Æsop's cock that "preferred the barley-corn before the gem;" and we may well bear in mind Bacon's warning of an error that we are liable to fall into, which is "a distrust that anything should be now to be found out which the world should have missed and passed over so long time." In this new search for new truths we may bear in mind again Bacon's warning that "no perfect discovery can be made upon a flat or a level; neither is it possible to discover the more remote and deeper parts of any science if you stand but upon the level of the

same science, and ascend not to a higher science." He does not enlarge on this, or explain what is intended, or give an example, so we must think it out for ourselves. I feel pretty sure that it is connected with what the *Times* reviewer called the Vertical method of interpretation. Why, Why, should members of this Society spend all their time going over the old ground and arguing about the jewels in the front of the poet's shop. Are there not some who will enter boldly into the Storehouse and search for still greater treasure? Why is this research, the most valuable of all, left to the professors and literary critics? And how is it that they can see that there are deep truths below the apparent show, while we, who claim to know something of the Author, are neglecting his own teaching and keeping on a flat or level. This inquiry demands from us some knowledge of symbolism and allegory, and we may get a little help here from modern psychology, but not much! Here is an extract from a letter written by one who was most nearly like Shake-Speare in his poetic genius, John Keats. Writing to his brother George on the 18th February, 1819, Keats says: "They are very shallow people who take everything literally. A man's life of any worth is a continual allegory and very few eyes can see the mystery of his life—a life, like the Scriptures, figurative—which such people can no more make out than they can the Hebrew Bible. Lord Byron cuts a figure, but he is not figurative. Shake-speare led a life of allegory, his works are the comments on it."

Now, all this talk of allegory and vertical interpretation is not meant to be solemn, and I hope it is not out of keeping with the spirit of a Birthday party. We have played our game of Hide and Seek, now we may try to do a cross-word puzzle, in which the vertical and the horizontal meet and join. I suppose that all here have tried cross-words at some time or other. They have had a strong hold on the minds of men and women in this country, and in small measure have revived interest in anagrams and word-play. Have you ever tried to lay aside the clues down and solve the puzzle on the clues across only? The words across may be thought of as the earthly life of a man, his day by day efforts to find the meaning of life. If the answer has been found to each question as it comes along, if all the words across have been correctly written, it will be found that the vertical words have fallen into their places. And when a man's life of supreme worth is, as Keats said, "a life of allegory," we may have the greatest of word puzzles in our hands, first to find and then to solve the Vertical clues, which are perhaps, what is being hinted at in the numerous marginal acrostics in the Folio of the Plays. But they go deeper than acrostics. I leave this great and poetic concept of "a life of allegory" with you. It may be that it will add more to our knowledge of Bacon's life on earth than any of the ciphers.

It may be that the use of capital letters, for which we must see the First Folio, are an indication of a hiding place. For instance, we read in *Cymbeline* (act iv., Sc. 2) "He cut our Rootes in Characters. . ."

"our Rootes," not the carrots for dinner but the roots of us, the English People, cut and engraved in the Characters in the great Histories of the Kings of England and other plays.

Again, consider the importance of the words of the prophecy by the Arch-Bishop at the baptism of the Princess Elizabeth, in the last Act of the "Famous History of the Life of King Henry VIII"

". . . But as when
The Bird of Wonder dyes, the Mayden phoenix
Her Ashes new create another Heyre,
As great in admiration as herselfe.
So shall she leave her Blessedness to One
(When Heaven shall call her from this clowd of darkness)
Who from the Sacred Ashes of her Honour
Shall star-like rise, as great in fame as she was,
And so stand fixt . . .
Wherever the bright Sunne of Heaven shall shine,
His Honour and the greatnesse of his Name,
Shall be, and make new Nations"

Commentators say that this prophecy relates to King James, successor to the throne of England, but by what stretch of imagination can King James be said to rise "from the Sacred Ashes of her Honour"? Even as a clue horizontal the words have the gravest significance for a woman; as a clue vertical the words with capital letters may lead deeper than as yet we can surmise. And note also the promise for that One who shall Star-like rise,

Wherever the bright Sunne of Heaven shall shine
His Honour and the greatnesse of his Name
Shall be, and make new Nations.

that is, not to make a new nation, even in the new world, but *to make new* the Nations (it is a capital N), which know and seek to know the true greatnesse of his Name.

To this new game of Seeking let us now devote ourselves, for we are facing a new world, in which England may be a "NEW NATION" at this crisis (or turning point) in our history. Francis Bacon, the Immortal Shake-speare, is, in Spirit, our Leader and inspiration; King in our Hearts and Minds.

M. SENNETT.

FRANCIS BACON'S TRAGIC YEAR

By HISTORICUS

IT is evident to students of the career of Francis Bacon that his most critical period of personal safety occurred just prior to the trial of Robert, Earl of Essex, in the early part of 1601. The circumstances which arose prior to the trial and the subsequent developments were far-reaching although little comprehended. Lying behind it all, I suggest, was that Queen Elizabeth had information that he was the real Shakespeare, author of the historical plays regarded as highly seditious and that he was literally black-mailed into appearing against Essex or of losing his own head.

To understand the implications it is important to touch first on the strange secret Inquiry of June 1600, at York House, the then residence of Sir Thomas Egerton, the Lord Keeper, where Essex was detained in custody for some months. The Earl had grievously offended the Queen by his arrogant conduct in Ireland to say nothing of his failure to bring Tyrone and the Irish chieftains to book. The charge preferred against him was that he had negotiated terms of peace with Tyrone without any authority or reference to the Queen and also of alleged intrigues to overthrow the Government and the person of the Queen herself.

These were indeed serious charges, especially when it is realised how jealous Elizabeth was of her royal prerogative. Essex had also had the temerity to knight several of his officers. "By God's death I am no Queen," she stormed passionately to Sir John Harington, who was among those he had knighted, "that man is above me!" It was so characteristic of Elizabeth, but had it been any other man than Essex can we doubt but that Tower Hill would have been his fate? Yet, as we know, the Inquiry was heard in secret session and as the result rash Essex was merely detained during Her Majesty's pleasure and soon after was released from custody, suffering no penalties other than dismissal from all his high offices of state, including that of Master of the Horse and the loss of certain valuable monopolies. Nevertheless, Elizabeth showed deep resentment towards him and all his efforts to placate her failed.

In this Inquiry the Queen went out of her way to require Francis Bacon to appear as one of the prosecuting counsel with the High Officers of the Crown, among whom he was not then numbered. Her attitude throws a strange sidelight on the circumstances. According to Birch (*Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*), so anxious was Bacon to be excused from appearing against Essex that he wrote to her to beg her to excuse him, she "knowing what had passed between the Queen and himself and what occasion he had given her to distaste and distrust in crossing her disposition by standing firm for his Lordship." Note, please, that those words imply that he had been given private audience and that he had vexed her by his championship of Essex, and that despite this he was called on to prosecute him.

Unless we know—as we do definitely from the Ciphers—that Bacon and Essex were brothers and both were sons of Elizabeth born in wedlock—such an audience and such a discussion as Birch mentions would be almost unthinkable, as also the sequel. For the Queen insisted on Bacon's appearance in a hostile role towards Essex and even decided what his brief was to be. Consider what it was.

In 1597, Dr. (later Sir John) Hayward, a Doctor of Common Law, a scholar and historian, wrote a history of Henry IV, and was later thrown into the Tower by Her Majesty in consequence of his alleged seditious work. In 1598 a second edition appeared. It contained a flowery dedication to the "Most Illustrious" Earl of Essex, and the work was described as a "most seditious pamphlet" by the Lords of the Council: "With your name adorning the part of our Henry" ran this dedication, "he may go forth to the public happier and safer." The hidden suggestion to the *cognocenti* was that if Henry IV, whose usurpation of the Throne was by the power of the sword, had been Essex, his right to it would have been stronger. Furthermore it could imply that Essex was a royal prince or it could be so interpreted. Elizabeth had in fact questioned Bacon—as he states in his *Apology* of 1604—whether the book did not constitute treason, and he evaded committing himself by the ambiguous jesting reply, that "for treason surely I found none; but for felony very many." On being further pressed he suggested that Hayward had plagiarised Tacitus, which was not only inaccurate as he doubtless knew but was liable to be interpreted as disingenuous.

Having thus been quizzed and cross-examined by the Queen previously upon this "seditious pamphlet," who for her part may have had a particular motive in so doing, he was now called upon to cross-examine Essex about this same offending book. He protested to my Lords Commissioners that Hayward's book had nothing to do with the affairs of Ireland, and he added a strange protest: "I having been wronged by bruits before, this would expose me to them more, and it would be said I gave mine own tales in evidence."¹ What then were these "bruits" or rumours which he declared had wronged him? And what interpretation can we place on the words that he would be accused of giving his own tales in evidence? Do not these words signify that he would be accused of employing his own supposed acts which might be regarded as treasonable as evidence against Essex? If such were not the inference what other can supply a logical explanation?

The implication in short is that Bacon was suspected of having either written the history of King Henry IV, using Hayward as his mask, or the fulsome adulatory dedication so characteristic of him. The Lords Commissioners at any rate apparently relished this somewhat grim "jest," and—I still cite Birch—"insisted that this part was fittest for him." How did they know that? If we supposed that he had had a hand in the work or that they so believed were the case,

¹Bacon: *Apology Concerning Essex*.

his enemies, not omitting Elizabeth herself, presumably hoped that Essex might give him away when he was placed in so invidious a position.

Behind this lay a deeper possibility. Did the Queen and her *fidus achates* Cecil suspect that Bacon was secretly engaged in producing seditious plays or other works under masked names? Shakespeare? Part I of Henry IV was published in quarto in 1598, the same year as the second edition of Hayward's Henry IV, and in 1600 there was published the Part 2 of the same Henry IV. Can we wonder that suspicion was aroused by the glut of publications one might say on that particular reign of an usurper? Moreover, what sort of market existed for it? In the circumstances it is scarcely remarkable if the Queen did question whether Hayward's book were seditious in intent.

From the proceedings against Essex in June 1600 we come to a fresh conundrum in the trials of Essex in February 1601. To the charge of high treason the Earl had no real defence. Coke, then Attorney General, asked Southampton whether "to seize with armed power upon the Court gate, the Court, the Privy Chamber, etc. thereby to bring the Queen into their power were not treason?" He contended that had they succeeded Essex and his friends would have done to Her Majesty what Henry of Lancaster did to Richard II. Henry went, said Coke, to the King and fell on his knees on the pretext of removing corrupt councillors—as was Essex's sole defence—but having once gotten the king into his power he deprived him both of kingdom and life. The gravamen of Coke's charge was that Essex by like means "affected to be king of England."¹

So here again, as in the former proceedings, the relationship between Henry of Lancaster and Richard II was made an important feature as a parallel instance of Essex's intent.

Bacon was again to appear against Essex in 1601 and his having so done has reacted strongly against him in the eyes of historians. Camden has preserved details of Bacon's conduct of the case, but actually the guilt of Essex was so clear that except for the apparent callousness and ingratitude which his action implied by accepting a brief, and the way whereby he vilified his erstwhile patron (vide the historians) or his own brother (vide the Bacon Ciphers), it made no difference to the result for that was a foregone conclusion. Bacon's character has suffered immeasurably in the eyes of posterity by this particular deed, and many have reproached him as a man of base ingratitude. To how many has it occurred that both in the Inquiry of 1600 and the Trial of 1601, Francis Bacon was compelled by *force majeure* very subtly applied, to humiliate himself by appearing as a false friend of Essex?

Let us not lose sight of the fact that with the exception of these two particular legal proceedings against Essex—against his own blood brother as the Ciphers insist again and again—the Queen had never shown the slightest disposition to assist him in his legal career.

¹Camden: *Annals of Elizabeth*, pp. 544-5.

On the contrary she passed over him on two occasions at least and when Essex, then in high favour, begged her to give him the post of Solicitor General she flatly refused. She was well aware of his talents but never put out her little finger to aid him yet knowing well how poor he was. The Ciphers explain clearly this deliberate neglect of the brilliant young advocate and lawyer but conventional history can accord no explanation. Yet in 1600 and 1601 he was significantly selected by the Crown to convict Essex.

What may we conclude from these queer manoeuvres? Was Elizabeth seeking a means to destroy Essex alone or did she strive to damn the character of Bacon as well?

Why Francis Bacon had to appear in 1601 as counsel whose task it was specially to discredit Essex is transparently made patent in Dr. Owen's Word Cipher. According to it, in a private audience before the trial he implored Elizabeth to show mercy to Essex. She bluntly refused: "Robert Essex was a worthy officer in the wars," she said, "but insolent, overcome with pride, ambitious past all thinking, self-loving and without assistance affecting our throne."

"I think not so," ejaculated Bacon.

She turned on him vehemently: "Villian! I'll set a point against thy breast if thou dost not use most dear employment in what I further shall intend to do." She declared that Essex should die, "as his offences are accounted to the law." When Bacon further appealed to her for mercy and hinted at tyranny, again she turned on him.

"Peace, peace sir, peace!" she exclaimed in anger, "Were I not made the better part of mercy I should not seek an absent argument of my revenge, *thou* present, *thou* traitor! Look to it, thou villain, thy life's dependent on thy brother's death! Let our instruction to thee be thy guide under penalty of thine own false head!"

What did she hint at? Bacon's reply to this truly scathing denunciation, according to his own Cipher Story, was the feeble answer, "I do partly understand your meaning."

Thereupon the Queen said scornfully, "Then go, get thee home, thou fragrant vile! Peruse this writing here and thou shalt know 'tis death for death, a brother for a brother!"

Let us consider the pregnant implication of this unhappy altercation. Not only had Bacon's intercession for Essex completely failed of its purpose but the Queen furiously angry had termed him a traitor, declared that were she not merciful she need not seek only the absent one—Essex—but *himself* present. She then threatened him that on the conviction of his brother his own life depended. Her "instruction," which he was to receive, meant the brief whereby he was to insure Essex's conviction. To all of which most terrible charge he could only say in faltering words, "I do partly understand your meaning." Finally she gave him a "writing," told him to read it, and then he would know why he must sacrifice his brother to save his own life.

What may we infer were the contents of the "writing" she so contemptuously handed to him? Surely the entire tenor of the audience suggests that she possessed evidence able to convict him as a traitor and that, unless Essex were executed, he himself would lose his head. Thus the "writing" must have contained particulars of some act or acts which would convict him of treason. I can see no alternative view short of a complete denial of the authenticity of the Cipher, as to which I need merely observe that its decipherer, Dr. W. Orville Owen, a highly respectable American medical practitioner of Detroit, Ohio, whose knowledge of English history, customs, and the dialect of Elizabethan times was exceedingly slender, could not possibly have invented such a situation, such local colour, and dialogue. I had the pleasure of his acquaintance and knew him well enough to assert that such an objection is as silly as ignorant. Moreover the conversation he recorded happens to fit exactly into other evidence which could not have been possibly known to him at the time.

The explanation I advanced is that Elizabeth had obtained evidence sufficient to convict Bacon of being no other than Shakespeare, and the author, *inter alia*, of Henry IV (Parts 1 and 2), and of Richard II. It was probably most unfortunate for Bacon that he published Part 1 of the Play in 1598 when the market already had Hayward's book or vice versa, and that in 1600, as though defiantly, Part 2 was published, presumably before the blow fell. It may well have seemed to the Queen, always suspicious of Bacon's schemes to supplant her, as made very plain in both the Owen and Gallup Ciphers, and to her cunning adviser Cecil, that it was an insidious attempt to influence the public to reconcile itself to a *coup d'état* by a popular Earl awaiting only the opportunity to announce himself as a royal prince. More colour was added to this incentive when we remember that on the afternoon of the Saturday preceding the Essex uprising, on February 7th, 1601, Sir Gilly Merrick, according to Bacon's own subsequent *Declaration*, with a great company of conspirators "procured to be played before them" Richard II, and paid forty shillings to the actors for the purpose. What the audience saw was a worthless and tyrannical king deposed and slain. Merrick seems to have paid the forty shillings to Augustine Phillips, who was later arrested together with Field and Henslowe, manager of the Globe Theatre. Did these give away the authorship of the play?

At all events, the performance of Richard II, specially acted on the eve of the Essex uprising, was one of the main counts of the prosecution. It was regarded as definitely seditious. Sir Gilly Merrick promptly lost his head. The play rankled in the Queen's mind, for a few months later she gave audience to William Lambarde, her "handsome man of Kent" in Greenwich Palace, to whom she said, "I am Richard the Second, know ye not that? This tragedy was played forty times in open streets and houses" (playhouses). That Bacon personally had any say in this performance is highly unlikely. He was strongly opposed to the conspiracy and did his best to dissuade

Essex from his rash action but if he were known to the Queen and Cecil as the author he had put himself on the spot. According to the Word Cipher Elizabeth was aware that he had written a play around Hamlet, before he was one and twenty, and burnt the manuscript before his own eyes. She was certainly well aware of his literary and stage proclivities.

That he was coerced into appearing against Essex at the latter's trial, and using all his endeavours to obtain a conviction, is admitted by himself in various passages in the Biltieral Cipher, as witness:

"Essex, who was also son unto Her Majesty and a brother bred—bone, blood, sinews as my own—was sentenced to death by that *mere* and my own counsel. Yet this truth must at some time be known: had I not thus allowed myself to give some countenance to the arraignment, a subsequent trial, as well as the sentence, I must have lost the life that I held so priceless. Life to a scholar is but a pawn for mankind."¹

By such means did Bacon seek to salve his conscience, admitting that Essex was sentenced to death by his mother and his own counsel but off-setting that otherwise he would himself have lost the life which, as a great scholar, philosopher, and poet, he was devoting to the good of mankind. In another passage he alludes to the awful situation with which he was confronted:

"I see most clearly not my own folly but my shameful weakness. In the blindness and confusion the moment's question loomed up before me and blotted out love, honour, all the joys of the past and dreams of far-off fame."²

He is obviously referring to the private audience when he was terrorised into accepting the task of prosecuting his brother by the sudden dire threat of the Queen. It is noteworthy that these two Cipher extracts are from that very *Declaration* which had to appear under his name the year of Essex's death. The onus was again thrown on him to damn his brother's name to posterity. While he was forced to pen that cruel document he sought to conceal in the Cipher of that very same attack his own explanation. There are other allusions to this blackmail which compelled him to incriminate Essex but I need only cite one other passage confirming Dr. Owen's Cipher:

"While succeeding barely in this attempt to so much as win a hearing, yet did the true love I bore so move me that, from my care for Essex I took a charge that greatly imperilled my personal pretensions, as I did occupy my utmost wit and even adventure my own fortunes with the Queen to attempt the reintegration of his. *This, however, though it had the will to do Essex great benefit, was truly less harmful unto my Lord Robert of Ewe, I may now admit, than to me.* Queen Elizabeth, my mother, yielded nought

¹lup: p. 22 from Bacon's *Declaration*, 1601. Dr. Owen's Word Cipher was published some years before Mr. Gallup discovered the secret of the Biltieral.

²Gallup, p. 22.

upon the question. . . Only thus can I banish from my thoughts, my beloved brother's untimely cutting-off and my wrongful part in his trial."¹

I contend that we cannot avoid the conclusion from this tragic episode in Bacon's life, and his admissions in the Ciphers, that he was forced to appear against Essex by duress, under the terrible threat of "a brother for a brother," and hence his later lament. Nor did the Queen's bitter yet subtle revenge on him end there. She compelled him to write his *Declaration* in which he sought to damn his brother's memory in the eyes of the world. The execution of Essex, it might be said, in a hole-and-corner manner, and the mysterious circumstances connected with it, had exerted a notable effect upon the populace. Much filtered through from the Court and other circles and was whispered about the trial and execution, with the result that the aging Queen's former popularity faded and as she passed on her progresses the applause she had so long enjoyed gave way to a cold and sullen demeanour of her lieges.

She thus suborned Bacon of all men to write a public justification, and, as he himself admits, "so as in man's sight Robert (Essex) is abhorred."² He says she altered and corrected the text herself owing to her "dread of execration," countermanded or suppressed the first copies and had them reprinted, so that it was truly her own justification but with the stigma resting on the head of the unhappy genius who fathered it and was held in an iron vice. As he admits, "the report satiated everyone."

Thus must we believe that Bacon was compelled to work for the conviction of Essex in order to save his own life, blackmailed to that end by the Queen, his own mother, who could have executed him on a charge of treason; and that he wrote his *Declaration*, thus in Elizabeth's eyes killing two birds with one stone, for firstly, he vilified the reputation of the popular Earl and so justified her action in beheading him, and, secondly, she undermined any loyalty felt for Bacon by forcing him into an entirely false position. In return it may seem that a pact was made whereby she pardoned his offence, and the agreement, tacit or otherwise, was known only to their two selves and necessarily to Robert Cecil, the lifelong enemy of Francis Bacon and Essex.

This explains an odd incident in court a little time after the Essex trial in which both Coke and Bacon were briefed. There was a disagreement between them on some point and Coke, a most offensive and objectionable man, said sneeringly to Bacon, "It were good to clap a *capias utlagatum* upon your back." Bacon, who immediately understood the implication, replied that he, Coke "could not (do so) and that he was at fault, for he hunted up an old scent." A *capias utlagatum* was a writ lying against a person who was outlawed or who fled from justice, and regarded in those days as a crime of highest

¹Gallup, pp. 41-42. ²op. cit. p. 43.

degree. It could apply to a subject who was an accessory to the flight of another from justice.

How could this apply to Bacon? According to Ignatius Donnelly's Numerical Cipher which effects to relate especially to the events of 1500-1, and derived from the two parts of Henry IV—deciphered many years before either Dr. Owen's or Mrs. Gallup's Ciphers appeared—Cecil had reported to the Queen that there was reason to believe that William Shaksper of Stratford-on-Avon was only a mask of Francis Bacon himself. It was decided to arrest Shaksper and make him disgorge the secret if necessary by torture. When Bacon heard of this he was in great fear and sent a trusted servant to remove Shaksper and conceal him until the hue and cry was over. Admittedly, Donnelly's Cipher cannot be regarded as authentic, unlike Dr. Owen's or Mrs. Gallup's, but Donnelly took exceptional pains to give chapter and verse for every word. All that can be said is that such a contingency would have explained Coke's insulting suggestion of a *capias utlagatum*, and Bacon's retort that he "hunted up an old scent," for assuming such were the case he had expiated his offence in procuring Shaksper to abscond.

For all that he was highly indignant at Coke's insinuation, and wrote to Cecil a protest, asking him to prevent such insults in future, a letter still extant. Cecil had divulged the secret pact and had betrayed it to his most dangerous enemy Coke. It must have been a serious matter when Bacon could bring himself to plead to Cecil. I believe Donnelly was quite right when he used these words:

"He knew that Bacon was the author of the play (Richard II) that therefore he knew that Bacon had shared in the conspiracy and that Bacon had to choose between this degrading work on his hands or going to the scaffold with Essex. It was humiliation bitterer than death."

There is little doubt that Coke's insult rankled deeply in Bacon's breast, and hence in 1604, he endeavoured to exculpate himself for Essex's death by writing his *Apology*, dedicated to Lord Mountjoy (Charles Blount). Elizabeth died in March 1603.

Bacon's advocacy in the trial of Essex could not deflect the rash Earl's fate by one iota, whether he had prosecuted or defended him. Yet in the eyes of the world he was guilty of the base desertion of a friend and patron. It was the callous and calculated determination of the Queen to execute the one of her sons who had dared to emulate Henry of Lancaster and to discredit the other in the sight of the unhappy Essex and the world which caused him such exquisite torture and remorse. These few pathetic lines express his innermost thoughts:

"I look upon myself and curse my fate. For why? Vile wretch of all mankind to serve the cruellest she alive, a Queen, the common mother of us both, with the sharpness of my edged sting. Against my brother I have taken arms. I curse myself that was my brother's fate."¹

¹Owen: *Word Cipher*, p. 68.

FRANCIS BACON AS EDUCATOR

By R. J. W. GENTRY

ALTHOUGH it is not on record that Francis Bacon ever participated in the actual business of teaching or lecturing, either as jurist or scientist, yet we do know that he once had the definite intention of becoming Provost of Eton College. In 1623, he applied for this position, but unsuccessfully, the appointment being ultimately bestowed on Sir Henry Wotton.

It is impossible to believe that this rejection of Bacon's suit was due to the King's being unable, in conscience, to consider him worthy of the place; in fact, Mr. Secretary Conway, to whom he had written asking for recommendation to the King, replied that His Majesty had said he could not value Francis so little, or conceive he would have humbled his desires and his worth so low.

Nevertheless, we can be certain that Bacon, although at that time he would have appreciated such a "cell to retire into," would in no way have regarded the office as a sinecure, a means merely of assuring himself of additional income. When he had written: "The college and school I do not doubt but I shall make to flourish," he meant it. His great industry, his sincere concern for the good of men, his enormous mental powers, would have ensured his utilising an opportunity to exercise authority in educational administration to the end that an enlightened outlook and a reinvigorated teaching system would have refreshed the great public school.

The fact that the labour of his last years was not destined to be employed directly in the interests of pedagogy leads one to imagine what loss that science sustained; for the earlier reflexions upon education of this bold, far-seeing genius show the intense devotion he felt towards the cause of training youth.

When Bacon surveyed the state of the universities of his day, he was moved to write plainly of their failings: "Many learn nothing there but to believe; first to believe that others know that which they know not; and after themselves know that which they know not. But indeed facility to believe, impatience to doubt, temerity to answer, glory to know, doubt to contradict, end to gain, sloth to search, seeking things in words, resting in part of nature; these and the like have been the things which have forbidden the happy match between the mind of man and the nature of things."(*In Praise of Knowledge*).

He places his finger on one of the chief causes of this unfortunate plight of learning: "It appeareth then how rarely the wits and labours of men have been converted to the service and original inquisitions of knowledge; and in those who have pretended, what hurt hath been done by the affectation of professors, and the distraction of such as

were no professors; and how there was never in effect any conjunction or combination of wits in the first and inducing search, but that every man wrought apart, and would either have his own way, or else would go no farther than his guide." (*Of the Interpretation of Nature*).

Bacon called for a comprehensive and vigorous investigation of natural phenomena—"the discovery of all operations and possibilities of operations from immortality, if that were possible, to the meanest mechanical practice," leaving aside commonly accepted opinions and authorities until they could be properly substantiated. Furthermore, in *The Advancement of Learning*, he points to the advantage of collaboration between scholars of all countries in the work of establishing a common knowledge, "for as the proficiencie of learning consisteth much in the orders and institutions of universities in the same states and kingdoms, so it would be yet more advanced, if there were more intelligence mutual between the universities of Europe than now there is."

Not less important, incidentally, is Bacon's plea for a fitting remuneration of those devoting their lives to teaching others. There is a defect, he contends, "in the smallness and meanness of the salary or reward, which in most places is assigned unto them," whereas "their condition and endowment (should) be such as may content the ablest man to appropriate his whole labour, and continue his whole age, in that function and attendance."

There should also be grants to provide facilities for scientific research, and a thorough inspection of the manner in which universities were being conducted. Bacon found, for example, what he considered a fault in the prevailing practice of students taking the subjects of logic and rhetoric at too early an age. These, he says, are "arts fitter for graduates than children and novices; for these two, rightly taken, are the gravest of sciences, being the arts of arts, the one for judgment, the other for ornament. And they be the rules and directives how to set forth and dispose matter, and therefore for minds empty and unfraught with matter, and which have not gathered that which Cicero calleth *sylva* and *supellex*, stuff and variety, to begin with those arts, as if one should learn to weigh, or to measure, or to paint the wind, doth work but this effect, that the wisdom of those arts, which is great and universal, is almost made contemptible, and is degenerate into childish sophistry and ridiculous affectation."

Logic and rhetoric had formed, with grammar, the *trivium* of the medieval schools, which had bequeathed a considerable body of educational experience to Bacon's time. The Church had early undertaken the responsibility of providing instruction for boys of promising ability in order that she might be assured a literate priesthood. There was then no educational system as we know it today; but there existed, after the decay of the monastic schools of the XIIth century, the chantry and cathedral schools teaching grammar to intending clerics and music to the young choristers.

Grammar ranked highly in the curriculum; Aeneas Silvius (afterwards Pope Pius II), writing to the King of Bohemia, in 1450, on the education of boys reiterated the words of William of Wykeham when he designated grammar as "the doorway of knowledge." It was now defined as: "*ars recte loquendi recteque scribendi scriptorum et poetarum lectionibus observata*," and as being "*initium et fundamentum omnium disciplinarum*."

We have little information regarding the curricula of our ancient schools, but Wolsey's statutes for his short-lived foundation at Ipswich in 1529 reveal much concern for the subject of letters. In the following year was published the great Cardinal's "*Rudimenta Grammatices et docendi methodus*," the pages of which contain his touchingly sympathetic remark: ". . . in which lytel boke I have left many things out of purpose, consyderying ye tendernes and smal capacite of lytell mynds." The formidable scheme of work carried on at Winchester also shows what emphasis had been placed on a thorough grounding in grammar. A. F. Leach states that the school-books of the time were still under the "over-refining spirit of dissection and classification which had been imbibed from the schoolmen" (*The Medieval Schools of England*). For example, Despautier, in his *Ars Epistolica*, divides letters into three classes: the descriptive, the political, and the familiar; while each letter is said to consist of a salutation, a statement, a petition, and a valediction or conclusion!

When we come to the treatises on versification, we find they "dwindle down into the most appallingly minute rules, with exceptions more numerous than the rules, as to the quantities of the various vowels in different locations." The medieval grammar was almost invariably in verse, with, in the late XVth and early XVIth century writers, an accompanying mass of marginal notes and prose commentary.

There can be little doubt that this arduous routine of grammar, with logic and rhetoric superadded, developed in the assiduous student a supple mind and facile tongue. The practice of logical analysis made him agile in debate, quick to perceive any divagation from the established rules of argument. His constant aim, in the *disputatio*, was to involve his opponent in fallacy; and one is impelled to the feeling that this consummation of his skill must have motivated his efforts more powerfully than the attempt to discover, with his fellow, the simple truth of things.

Stow gives us a picture of the scene about the year 1533; "For I myself in my youth have yearly seen, on the eve of S. Bartholomew the Apostle, the scholars of diverse grammar schools repair unto the Churchyard of S. Bartholomew, the Priory in Smithfield, where, upon a bank boarded about under a tree, some one scholar hath stepped up and there hath opposed and answered, till he were by some better scholar overcome and put down, and then the overcomer, taking the place, did like as the first, and in the end the best opposers and answerers had rewards, which I observed not but it made both good

schoolmasters and also good scholars diligently against such times to prepare themselves for the obtaining of the garland."

Another witness to the enthusiasm rife in those days for public debate is William Fitzstephen, who, in the preface to his biography of Thomas à Becket, writes: "On feast days, the (school)masters celebrate assemblies at the churches, arrayed in festive garb. The scholars hold disputations, some argumentatively, others by way of question and answer. These roll out enthymemes, those use the forms of perfect syllogisms. Some dispute for show, as they do at collections; others for the truth which is the grace of perfection. The sophists, and those in training in sophistry, are pronounced happy because of the mass and volume of their words; others play upon words. Those learning rhetoric, with rhetorical speeches speak to the point with a view to persuasion, being careful to observe the precepts of their art, and to leave out nothing that belongs to it."

Perhaps Fitzstephen envisaged an ideal when referring to these youthful *cymini sectores* as striving for the truth, and speaking to the point. Disputing for mere show must have been a constant temptation, and verbal exhibitionism given plenty of scope. One thinks of Bacon's dictum as to "cobwebs of learning, admirable for fineness of thread, but of no substance or profit."

The great philosopher, however, did not deny to the educational method of the later Middle Ages its due meed of praise for certain excellences. In the *Advancement of Learning*, he speaks of the schoolmen as having "sharp and strong wits," and declares, "if to their great thirst of truth and unwearied travail of wit, (they) had joined variety and universality of reading and contemplation, they had proved excellent lights, to the great advancement of all learning and knowledge." This, unfortunately, the schoolmen did not do, and Bacon gives further reasons why they fell into an intellectual slough. Their method, he says, rested "not so much upon evidence of truth proved by argument, authorities, similitudes, examples, as upon particular confutations and solutions of every scruple, cavillation, and objection; breeding for the most part one question as fast as it solveth another." Their procedure may, in the earlier stages, have produced "generalities for awhile good and proportionable"; but when it resulted in numberless controverises and altercations, men tended at last to regard truth as merely an occasioⁿ, as Bacon puts it, for "digladiation about subtilties, and matter of no use or moment." The setting up of the one great light of scientific method was obstructed by the prevailing habit of "going about into every corner with a small watch-candle."

In the *Advancement* also, Bacon considers the science of grammar. Its use is greatest, he argues, when deriving from the study of "such foreign tongues as have ceased to be vulgar tongues, and are turned only to learned tongues." There are two aspects of its value as a human preoccupation: its advantage in enabling a language to be mastered speedily for the purposes of conversation and reading works

in the language; and the exercise of the discriminatory powers in the examination of language itself as an instrument for the expression of thought. Language is to be studied analytically if students are to avoid the false appearances, entanglements, and perversions of judgment imposed upon them when words are "framed and applied according to the conceit and capacities of the vulgar sort." Bacon at once adjured them "in all controversies and disputations to imitate the wisdom of the mathematics, in setting down in the very beginning the definitions of our words and terms, that others may know how we accept and understand them, and whether they concur with us or no. For it cometh to pass, for want of this, that we are sure to end there where we ought to have begun, which is in questions and differences about words." Earlier, he had written of equivocation or ambiguity of words and phrases, especially those in common use in argument as being the "great sophism of all sophisms."

He divided grammar into two sections, literary and philosophical. Literary grammar was to deal with the cognition of words themselves, with everything pertaining to their sound, measure, and accent, and particularly the versification of poetry; philosophical grammar was to investigate the relation of words to things, and to the human reason. Here he clearly foreshadows the systematic precision in the usage of terms which characterises the science of semantics, even now only in its beginnings, yet assured of a vitally important future as man progresses towards a reliable mode of communicating his thought.

Bacon proceeds, in the same Work, to scrutinize the other two subjects of the scholastic *trivium*, logic and rhetoric. The arts of judgment, he says, handle the nature of proofs and demonstrations. Contemporary logic, however, had largely contented itself with discovering the "more subtle forms of sophism and illaqueations, with their redargutions," although the "degenerate and corrupt use is for caption and contradiction, which passeth for a great faculty." Too close an attachment to the ordinances of ancient thinkers, especially Aristotle; the erection of these into eternal principles; a disinclination to explore nature directly; all these faults had resulted in a stagnation of learning. Moreover, the syllogism had been hitherto employed all too frequently as though it provided, if correctly constructed, an adequate explanation of a phenomenon, whereas it was incapable of establishing absolute truth, being only a conditional affirmation.

Bacon was concerned not so much to attack the accepted forms of deductive reasoning as to insist on the need to build sound premisses by a more scientific inductive process. In the *Prolegomena to the Instauration Magna*, he maintains: "The end which this science of ours proposes is, to find out not arguments, but arts; and not what may be accordant with principles, but principles themselves; and not probable reasons, but designations, and indications of effects. And so from a different purpose follows a different result. For there an adversary is vanquished and constrained by disputation; here nature

by operation. And with the diverse ends agree the nature and order of demonstration in the two. For in the vulgar logic, almost the whole labour is spent about the Syllogism. Respecting Induction, the dialecticians seem to have scarcely ever seriously thought; merely passing it over with slight mention as they hasten on to their formulas of disputation."

The *Parasceve* lays down rules by which facts must be collected, arranged, and analysed. No facile leap from individual truths to wide generalisations, and deduction from these of propositions of medium generality, is to be tolerated. The Formula for Interpretation proceeds, in the words of C. D. Broad (*The Philosophy of Francis Bacon*), "in a very gradual ascent from particulars through middle principles to the highest laws and a very gradual descent from these to new middle principles and finally to new particulars. At every stage of the upward process the generalisation is to cover the then known facts and to extend a very little way beyond them, and this small extension is to be tested by a fresh appeal to experience. Thus the ascending and descending process, like the movement of the angels on Jacob's ladder, take place side by side; and the latter is the means of testing the validity of the former. . . . We must substitute for induction by simple enumeration a method which makes use of negative instances and arrives at truth by successive elimination of false alternatives."

It is not difficult to understand why Bacon deplored as sterile the setting of routine logical exercises to "young and unripe wits," still in the classroom, when he held reasoning to be rather the proper business of mature minds, purged of the Idols and served by senses and memories corrected and supplemented by the Ministrations set forth in the *Novum Organum*. Ever in his mind's eye were the practical ends of intellectual activity, and if nothing issued from such labour in the schools except intelligences drilled in limited modes of tortuous ingenuity, he had good grounds for demanding a reformed curriculum which deferred logic to the university stage. Far more profitable as an earlier study would have been what he calls "Instructed Experience,"—the passing from one experiment to another analogous to it, with careful observation, comparison, and classification.

Of rhetoric, Bacon writes that it is "a science excellent, and excellently laboured," and maintains that although it is inferior in value to wisdom, yet with people it is more mighty, and "prevaileth in an active life." The aim of rhetoric, he says, is to fill the imagination to second reason, and not to oppress it. To be perfectly reasonable in argument with men is one thing, but to affect the whole man, his imaginative part as well as his rational, is another; and the art of eloquence encompasses this. Pure ratiocination may often miss its mark if it is regardless of the general psychological disposition of the one at whom it is directed. Eloquence can present a case "in the round," so to speak, and appeal to more sides of human nature.

When dealing with the generality of men, and not only with philosophers, one has to "speak to them all respectively, and several ways." One may not "thrust virtue upon men by sharp disputations and conclusions, which have no sympathy with the will of man"; by "volubility of application" it is more likely we may persuade them to better courses.

Now this skill cannot be learnt, as the rules of grammar, in the classroom. It entails experience of men, a wise and full estimation of the emotional forces swaying them one way and another. Hence Bacon's contention that this study be pursued at a later age than was the common practice of his times, thus showing again his great discernment and understanding of the human being.

Also set down, in the *Advancement*, are Bacon's views on the "Traditive Art," by which is meant the method of conveying knowledge from one mind to another. He says: ". . . as knowledges are now delivered, there is a kind of contract of error between the deliverer and the receiver: for he that delivereth knowledge desireth to deliver it in such form as may be best believed, and not as may be best examined; and he that receiveth knowledge desireth rather present satisfaction than expectant inquiry; and so rather not to doubt than not to err; glory making the author not to lay open his weakness, and sloth making the disciple not to know his strength." A more penetrating observation upon a major cause of incompetent teaching and fruitless study has never been made, and it has its application today, in spite of our undoubted enlightenment in pedagogical practice.

Bacon had pointed out that a good instructional method had four marks by which it may be recognised:—

(i) It judges accurately what is appropriate to be taught, and at what stage of the pupil's mental development;

(ii) It knows where to begin in a subject, and how to proceed in a natural manner from the easier to the more difficult matter, and to render the latter assimilable to the pupil as he advances to it;

(iii) It is able to prescribe the right subjects of study for the various types of mind, especially with a view to rectifying mental defects;

(iiii) It can discriminate between what should be exercised and developed in a character, and what allowed to die out through inattention.

Further to (iii), he gives as his recipe for treating inattentiveness the study of mathematics, for "if a child be bird-witted. . . the mathematics giveth a remedy thereunto, for in them, if the wit be carried away for but a moment, one is new to begin again." His advice, that "it is an inquiry of great wisdom what kinds of wits and natures are most proper for what sciences," can certainly be regarded as a basis upon which later research in educational psychology has been reared. "There is no stond or impediment in the wit, but may be wrought out by fit studies." Indeed, the whole *Essay Of Studies* is a piece of close thinking upon the matter and manner of education.

One mode of teaching which found much favour in Bacon's eyes was that of "aphorisms." This means of imparting knowledge he considers superior to the ordinary elaborate and formalised teaching, inasmuch as the latter gives the appearance of completeness and rests in a self-sufficient complacency, while aphorisms, "representing a knowledge broken, do invite men to inquire further." He who uses this aphoristic method is tested in his own solidity of learning, for, bereft of discourse of illustration, connexion and order, recital of examples, descriptions of practice, he will need to be well grounded and build his aphorisms out of the "pith and heart of sciences."

In these days, when emphasis is being placed upon technical training and utilitarianism in education, it is interesting to recall the salutary reproach which Bacon levelled at the scholastic trend of his own times. This indictment occurs in the following words: "Among so many great foundations of colleges in Europe, I find it strange that they are all dedicated to professions, and none left free to arts and sciences at large. For if men judge that learning should be referred to action, they judge well; but in this they fall into the error described in the ancient fable, in which the other parts of the body did suppose the stomach had been idle, because it neither performed the office of motion, as the limbs do, nor of sense, as the head doth; but yet, notwithstanding, it is the stomach that digesteth and distributeth to all the rest: so if any man think philosophy and universality to be idle studies, he doth not consider that all professions are from thence served and supplied. And this I take to be a great cause that hath hindered the progression of learning, because these fundamental knowledges have been studied but in passage. For if you will have a tree bear more fruit than it hath used to do, it is not anything you can do to the boughs, but it is the stirring of the earth, and putting new mould about the roots, that must work it." An eloquent plea for a serious reconsideration of any wholesale drive to expand education for a living at the expense of education for living!

That Bacon's ideas on schooling commanded the respectful notice of experts beyond the limits of his own country is evidenced by the references made to him by John Amos Comenius (1592-1670), the famous teacher of Moravia. The *Novum Organum* had appeared in 1620, and had been read with great interest by Comenius, who speaks of its author, in company with Campanella, as "philosophiæ restauratores gloriosos" in his *Opera Didactica Omnia*. Although the Pansophic conceptions of Comenius had little in common with our own philosopher's "artificial induction," being concerned to treat of the whole universe of man's experience, and not limited to natural phenomena, yet he says that Bacon had discovered the essential method of separating the true from the false. There is firm agreement between these two eminent thinkers that, the preoccupation of the schools almost entirely with language can never be other than a hindrance to proper intellectual development. Teachers have not shewn their pupils "the objective world as it exists in itself, but only

what this, or that, or the other author has written or thought about this or that object, so that he is considered the most learned who best knows the contradictory opinions which many men have held about things." (*The Great Didactic*, Keatinge's trans.). He further states that "scarcely anyone teaches physics by ocular demonstration and by experiment, but only by quoting the works of Aristotle and others." No information should be imparted simply on the grounds of bookish authority, but should be authenticated by actual disclosure to the senses and the mind. How closely this sorts with the remark in *The Advancement of Learning*: "Men have withdrawn themselves too much from the contemplation of nature, and the observations of experience, and have tumbled up and down in their own reasons and conceits."

Stress is laid by both writers on the virtue of a good memory, and Comenius quotes Ludovicus Vives with approval on its training: "Commit something to memory daily, for the more you commit to memory, the more faithfully it will be retained, and the less, the less faithfully." (Vives' *Introduction to Philosophy*). Compare this with Bacon's : ". . . the disposition and collocation of that knowledge which we preserve in writing . . . consisteth in a good digest of commonplaces; wherein I am not ignorant of the prejudice imputed to the use of commonplace books, as causing a retardation of reading, and some sloth or relaxation of memory. But because it is but a counterfeit thing in knowledges to be forward and pregnant, except a man be deep and full, I hold the entry of commonplaces to be a matter of great use and essence in studying, as that which assureth copy of invention, and contracteth judgment to a strength. But this is true, that of the methods of commonplaces that I have seen, there is none of sufficient worth, all of them carrying merely the face of a school, and not of a world, and referring to vulgar matters, and pedantical divisions, without all life, or respect of action." The *Promus of Formularies and Elegancies* wherein Bacon himself deposited literary material for his future use, well embodies the precept he commends in the foregoing.

Comenius follows the Englishman, too, in his high estimate of dramatic presentations as an aid to learning. In the Latin version of *The Advancement*, Bacon expresses this interesting view of stage-plays as an educative force: "Dramatic Poesy, which has the theatre for its world, would be of excellent use if well directed. For the stage is capable of no small influence both of discipline and of corruption. Now of corruptions in this kind we have enough; but the discipline has in our times been plainly neglected. And though in modern states play-acting is esteemed but as a toy, except when it is too satirical and biting; yet among the ancients it was used as a means of educating men's minds to virtue. Nay, it has been regarded by learned men and great philosophers as a kind of musician's bow by which men's minds may be played upon. And certainly it is most true, and one of the great secrets of nature, that the minds of men are more open to impressions and affections when many are gathered

together than when they are alone." (Spedding's trans.). In the later writer is to be found: "We remember an event better when we have seen it ourselves than when we have simply heard it narrated, and, in the same way, instruction that is given through the medium of a drama or a dialogue stays in the heads of scholars far better than if it be simply set forth in the ordinary way, as may be proved by experience." (*The Great Didactic*).

One final parallelism may be cited. Comenius has: "Truly it has been said, that nothing is more useless than to learn and to know much, if such knowledge be of no avail for practical purposes; and again, that not he who knows much is wise, but he who knows what is useful." Bacon has a comparable opinion: "We see remote and superficial generalities do but offer knowledge to scorn of practical men, and are no more aiding to practice than an Ortelius's universal map is to direct the way between London and York."

In this present time of bewilderment of peoples, with their growing sense of helplessness in the spiritual void created by the collapse of traditional religious belief and long-established political institutions, the saving wisdom of a great Genius, whose life was devoted to the "relief of man's estate," may well guide those concerned in the vital task of moulding the new generation, into a clearer and finer idealism. We see the evil towards which ruthless and unprincipled men may drag the world; to use Francis Bacon's very words, from his *Essay Of Custom and Education*: "... the misery is, that the most effectual means are now applied to the ends least to be desired." May the example of his life, his fortitude and devotion of soul, his unremitting efforts to unscale men's eyes to truth and the works of genuine piety, his sympathy with the cause of universal brotherhood and understanding, yet become our inspiration to a sane way of life among the peoples of the earth, before it is too late.

SIR FRANCIS BACON

Uncrowned King of England

King of men's minds, but King of England too,
 By ev'ry right, yet, subject to king's will,
 Thou gavest up thy claim with homage true,
 Thy loyal oaths to kingship to fulfil.
 Disgraced, imprisoned, still thy royal mind
 Refused to lose its high and noble mien,
 Never shall men throughout the ages find
 More perfect king than once this world hath seen!

EDITH M. DUNNE

Gt. Crosby
 March 1947

THE OXFORDIANS' FREAKISH CLAIMS TO SHAKESPEARE

AN ANALYSIS OF DE VERE'S CAREER AND KNOWN VERSES

By COMYNS BEAUMONT

AS a Baconian I have been lately intrigued by the quaint antics of the Shakespeare Fellowship, whose most energetic figure is Mr. Percy Allen, and whose policy appears to stage, if possible, debates between speakers of the Bacon Society and himself as representing the claims of the Oxfordians. Our representatives have become somewhat tired of these discussions because, as was shown in a report of such a meeting in May last year, whilst our speakers argued the case for Francis Bacon on evidence, giving chapter and verse, Mr. Allen ignored all these and relied simply upon a number of unproven and audacious assertions that Edward de Vere was in fact the author of the Shakespeare plays and poems. Such debates are futile.

Being myself ignorant of what evidence could be produced in favour of the seventeenth Earl of Oxford as the concealed Shakespeare, and having regarded him hitherto merely as a foppish favourite of Queen Elizabeth, I have of late studied the subject as far as possible from what history knows of him and from publications advocating the claims made.

First of all it is necessary to take stock of the man himself, because his career and character are essential to a proper understanding. It is true that genius has sometimes been allied to a dissolute and licentious character, but in this instance we have a very exceptional personality in the creator of the Shakespeare plays and poems, one who reveals himself not only as a great poet but a thousand-fold as a man of the most lofty ideals, of divine judgment, of the highest principles, a far-sighted philosopher and a sage of immense learning and wisdom, in short a superb soul, for which reasons his works have been placed by the world upon so mighty a pedestal. In the case of Francis Bacon, who early in life proclaimed, and as his career proved, that the education and elevation of mankind were his "Philanthropia," the two tally. What of Edward de Vere?

To his own generation, despite his aristocratic birth, he became despised even at Court. According to his contemporaries he was a mass of vanity, licentious and dissolute, a notorious spendthrift for no purpose except to show his importance, a gambler, a man who treated his first wife, Anne Cecil, with callous cruelty and more than indifference, a spoilt and worthless popinjay. He squan-

dered a great estate and died at the age of fifty-four leaving behind him a rotten reputation and a debauched son by his second wife, who sold such estates as remained and existed by sordid and unworthy methods.

This man, we are asked to believe, was Shakespeare!

Inheriting his vast estate, the Premier Earl and Hereditary Lord Great Chamberlain, succeeded his father in 1562, in his thirteenth year, and became accordingly a Royal Ward, whose affairs were directed by Cecil, Lord Burleigh, Master of the Court of Royal Wards. His first noted act, soon after he was seventeen, while residing in Cecil House, was to run his sword through an undercook who died, as to which the Coroner's jury, persuaded by influential persons, brought in a verdict of *felo-de-se* and so saved the Earl's face. Oxford was always overbearing, petulant and short-tempered.

At the age of one-and-twenty he married Cecil's daughter, Anne, a child just fifteen, a match engineered by Burleigh, and, as he then fancied, a great match, having regard to Oxford's wealth and his pedigree, whereas in those days the Cecils were *parvenus*. Why Oxford married Anne is obscure, for he treated her with utter indifference and contumely from the first. There is a great deal of obscurity in fact in regard to this marriage, for shortly after he was travelling abroad with a princely retinue but no wife. Thomas Lodge, son of a Lord Mayor of London, a well-known contemporary literary figure in close contact with Court chatter, wrote that "when the Duke of Norfolk whom he (Oxford) loved, was condemned, he applied to Lord Burleigh, whose daughter he had married, passionately beseeching him to interfere in the Duke's behalf; but his request being refused, he told Burleigh, with the utmost fury, that he would revenge himself by ruining the Countess; and he made his threat good; for from that hour he treated her with the most shocking brutality and having broken her heart, sold and dissipated the most part of his great fortune."

What we do know about Oxford is that he treated his wife with such indifference and neglect that she had to live with her parents. All this time he was flirting with the Queen. In 1574 he jaunted off to the Low Countries, but the Queen ordered him back. In 1575 he was permitted to go abroad and made his way by Paris to Padua, Venice, and Florence, where he stayed *en prince* until April 1576 when he was recalled by Burleigh, all of which time he was squandering his substance at a tremendous rate and was appealing to Burleigh to raise him monies. His father-in-law had written to tell him that his wife had given birth to a daughter in July 1575, but there is no evidence that he wrote a word to her. When the two met him on arrival in the Thames he brusquely brushed them aside, refused to have any speech with either of them, and made his way post-haste to the Queen.

Strange stories were abroad respecting the paternity of the child, which were ultimately clarified. There is little doubt that Shake-

spere's comedy, *Alls Well that Ends Well* though based on a story in Boccaccio's "Decameron," was written round Oxford, who appears as Count Bertram, and that Helena, who by a stratagem induces her husband to sleep with her thinking she was another woman, was Anne Cecil. Considering what a conceited, self-centred prig Shakespeare makes of Bertram, it would be strange indeed if that conceited coxcomb Oxford, would thus pillory himself.

Was this the type of man to be capable of great flights of empiricism?

Isaac Disraeli, in his "Curiosities" throws a sidelight on the Earl. He was (says he) of the highest rank, in great favour with the Queen, and when English fashions were moulding themselves on the Italian model, he was the "Mirrour of Tuscanismo," and returned, after residence in Florence, highly "Italianated." Haughty of descent, continues Disraeli, irritable, with effeminate delicacy and personal vanity, a little circumstance inflicted such an injury to his pride that he exiled himself abroad. It seems to have been some awkward obeisance but it "so sensibly hurt his mawkish dignity that he could not raise his eyes on his royal mistress." He banished himself and lived in more grandeur than the Grand Duke of Tuscany, and spent on these travels forty thousand pounds, an immense fortune in those days. On his return he presented Elizabeth with embroidered gloves and perfumes, for the first time introduced into England, as Stow observes. She received them graciously. According to the Dictionary of National Biography, "he returned laden with luxurious articles of dress, and of the toilet, embroidered gloves, sweet-bags, perfumed leather jerkins, costly washes and perfumes."

Gabriel Harvey, who instructed Francis Bacon in poesy, at Cambridge, had no exalted opinion of this fop and hit him off as follows:

"A little apish hat, couched fast to the pate, like an oyster,
French cambric cuffs, deep with a witsesse, starched to the
purpose,
Delicate in speech, quaint in array, conceited in all points;
In courtly guises, a passing singular odd man."

And he, say the Oxfordians, was Shakespeare!

Behind his rough and rude treatment of his young wife lay his infatuation for Elizabeth, although had she been a plain "miss" instead of a reigning sovereign it might have been different. We know how much she invited and loved admiration and Oxford was one of her absolute devotees. Besides Leicester, she had various lovers, as history records. In 1571-2, when Oxford was first prominent at Court, the Queen, seventeen years older, toyed with the youth. We find the gossipy Gilbert Talbot, writing to his father the Earl of Shrewsbury, and saying, "My Lord of Oxford is lately grown into great credit, for the Queen's Majesty delighteth more in his personage and his dancing, and his valiantness than any other. If it were not

for his fickle head he would pass any of them shortly." Then he adds, "My Lady Burleigh unwisely hath declared herself, as it were, jealous, which is come to the Queen's ear; whereat she hath been not a little offended with her, but now she is reconciled again." Lady Burleigh was, of course, the mother of Oxford's young wife, and resented these signs of familiarity.

Sir Christopher Hatton was Elizabeth's particular admirer at this time and is represented as being very jealous of the favours shown to young Oxford. Hatton first attracted her attention at a masque given by the members of the Inner Temple in 1561 where he was Master of the masque she attended. He was handsome and virile, and in the ensuing years she lavished estates and wealth upon him; in 1571 he was appointed Captain of her Bodyguard and a Gentleman of her Chamber whence every opportunity for intimacy existed. When his health broke down in 1572 she turned her gaze on young Oxford. How far Hatton went with the Queen must remain undetermined, but letters of his survive such as "Passion overcomes me. Love me for I love you. Would to God I were with you but for one hour!" If these words did not imply sexual attraction, nothing does. He signed himself as "your Mutton," or as "Lyddes" (eyelids). When she was reputed to be transferring her attentions to De Vere, he complained to his friend Sir Edward Dyer, who wrote him on Oct. 9th, 1572, advising him not to reproach the Queen for "change of sentiments," and added, "you must consider with whom you have to deal . . . who, though she do descend very much in her sex as a woman, yet we may not forget her place." The innuendo bears the construction that she was vicarious in such matters.

How long Oxford remained in her good graces can only be conjectured, but is it a coincidence that for some ten years he repudiated his wife? In 1579, Elizabeth visited Havering, the ancient seat of the De Veres, and Fulke Greville says that Oxford was then superlative in her favour. But in 1580 he blotted his copybook with her completely by the scandal of his liaison with Anne Vavasour, one of the Queen's Maids-in-Waiting, which infuriated Elizabeth who sent both of them to the Tower. Whether Anne was or was not a "drab," as Burleigh designated her—he was always coarse in his allusions to women—she gave birth to a child by Oxford. In 1581 he was released from imprisonment but for nearly three years afterwards he was still in the Queen's bad graces and was exiled from Court. It was then that he became nominally reconciled to his wife, who wrote him a pathetic letter, at the very end of 1581, but in the February following he departed irately abroad until about June 1583, without his wife. It is a permissible inference that from 1571 until 1580, when he so angered Elizabeth when his liaison with Anne Vavasour came to light, that he was admitted as a lover, whence Hatton's hatred of him, and his otherwise unaccountable attitude towards his wife.

I cannot follow this man's complete career in one article but it might be mentioned that, squandering his immense fortunes, he

sold estate after estate, and was continually pleading with Burleigh to raise him more money, until in 1590 he was bankrupt with debts of £22,000. So pressed was he that in 1592 he tried to commute a Privy Seal grant of £1,000 per annum, for £5,000 cash. What the grant was for has never been explained. The Oxfordians claim, without a vestige of evidence, that it was because he was writing plays for the Queen's amusement! Capt. B. M. Ward, in his book, "The Seventeenth Earl of Oxford," audaciously argued the necessity of a Propaganda Bureau in 1586, and Miss Clark, in "The Man Who Was Shakespeare" boldly announces it as "for the continuance of stage propaganda," otherwise the Shakespearean plays.

To use a slang term, this is all poppycock! To conjecture is one thing, but to assert, as all the Oxfordians do, on no grounds at all except guesswork and then to proceed to claim all the Shakespeare plays and sonnets as divinely inspired by this worthless peer seems to transcend literary decency.

There is little to add to his known career. He ill-treated his young wife to the end, who died in 1588, aged only thirty-two, whose funeral he did not even attend, and in 1591 married again, Elizabeth Trentham, whose brother lent him £10,000 to clear the Oxford estates, mortgaged to the hilt by his profligacy and vanity. His licentiousness was marked. In 1585, Anne Vavasour's brother, Thomas, challenged him to a duel and insulted him in these words: "If thy body had been as deformed as thy mind is dishonourable, my house had been yet unspotted, and thyself remained with thy cowardice unknown"—for Oxford did not accept the challenge. From other sources of the period we read that "the world never brought forth such a villainous monster . . . a beast in all respects, and in him no virtue to be found and no vice wanting." Arundel, who knew him well, wrote of the "horrible enormities, great beastliness, detestable vices of this monstrous earl were a labour without end." Another report says, "He has lost all credit and honour and has been abandoned by all his friends and by all the ladies of the Court. Finding himself alone and unsupported, he threw himself on his knees several times before the Queen."

His despicable treatment of his wife is enough to proclaim him a callous scoundrel. In Wright's "History of Essex," where Oxford had his principal seat, it said that Burleigh contrived by stratagem that Lady Oxford's husband should unknowingly sleep with her and she bore a son to him in consequence. I agree with the late distinguished Baconian, Henry Seymour, that it was more probably a device of Robert Cecil, Burleigh's hunchback son, whom he identifies as Parolles in *All's Well That Ends Well*. Burleigh's own view of Oxford is contained in one pithy phrase written in 1587: "His lewd friends still rule him by flatteries."

Such was the character of the disreputable man the Oxfordians hail as Shakespeare!

When it comes to the claims made of Oxford's authorship it is

difficult to believe that his supporters are serious. Miss Clark's book, expensively produced, which I have studied with care because she summarises the whole case for De Vere and uses previous Oxfordian "authorities" jumps to extraordinary conclusions of which I select merely a few:

(1) Because he was a courtier and often at Windsor, therefore he wrote *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

(2) Thinks it probable he wrote *Richard III*, while imprisoned in the Tower, which would account for twenty-six references to it.

(3) As he penned an indignant letter to Burleigh, using the words "I am that I am," therefore he wrote Sonnet 121, which says, "No, I am that I am."

(4) That as he bought the Geneva Bible, Chaucer, Plutarch, two Italian books, Tully's and Plato's works in folio, it was "confirmatory of the claim that the Earl of Oxford was the dramatist who wrote the Shakespeare plays."

(5) In 1593, he dismissed John Lyly from his service and used the name of Shaksper instead to conceal himself as author.

(6) In 1593, *Venus and Adonis* was published under Shakespeare's name, and if the letter "V" and "A" are reversed it reads "A.V." otherwise Anne Vavasour. Also in 1594 appeared *The Rape of Lucrece*, and both were dedicated to the Earl of Southampton, who was engaged to Oxford's elder daughter for a time.

(7) The best dramatist in 1583 was the Earl of Oxford, and he, having been recently restored to the Queen's favour, and anxious to please, thereupon wrote in rather rapid succession some of the greatest plays later known as Shakespeare's: namely, *Othello*, *The Tempest*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Hamlet* 1 *Henry IV*, *Merry Wives of Windsor* and others, as shown by contemporary events.

I could continue these blatant, and so ingenuous as to be really funny, assertions *ad nauseam* for they are all much of a muchness and seem to be fairly representative of the sort of stuff the Oxfordians bring out in their debates if permitted. I venture to doubt if Edward De Vere ever wrote anything at all except a few almost amateurish lyrics or verses. If he had a reputation as a playwright at all let us recollect that he employed for many years two Elizabethan dramatists, Anthony Munday and John Lyly, the author of "Euphues" (which he dedicated to Oxford, as well he might), both of whom wrote plays for his theatrical company. They were there to afford him any aid to branch out as a poet and playwright.

Even so, allusions to him are few and vague. William Webbe in "A Discourse of English Poetry" (1586) mentions "many honourable and noble Lords and Gentlemen in Her Majesty's Court . . . among whom the Right Honourable Earl of Oxford may challenge to himself the title of the most excellent among the rest." In 1589, the anonymous author of "The Arte of English Poesie" speaks of "another crew of Courtly makers (poets) Noblemen and Gentlemen . . . of which

number is first that noble gentleman Edward, Earl of Oxford." Later he mentions Oxford for Comedy and Interlude. These praises are in both instances accorded to noblemen and courtiers among whom by his rank Oxford was outstanding. If they were notable it was solely because in Elizabethan days, the arts and literature were despised as perhaps not quite manly. Prowess in the tilt-yard was what counted among the aristocracy.

In Henry Peacham's "The Compleat Gentleman" (1622) discussing poetry, are included Edward, Earl of Oxford, Lord Buckhurst, Henry, Lord Paget, Sir Philip Sidney, and some others, including, curiously enough, Edmund Spenser, who was never a courtier. They were all (except Spenser and, say Sidney) very minor poets, and we might expect allowance to be made for the nobility who wrote verse in an age when it was considered foppish and even effeminate in England. Peacham, be it noted, was alluding to the "compleat Gentleman" who indulged in the art, not the common professional.

There remains Meres' "Palladis Tamea" (1598) on which the Oxfordians appear to set so much store. In it the name of Shakespeare is mentioned glowingly under eight different headings, such as tragedy, comedy, elegy, and so forth, concerned with poetry and plays. It is an exhaustive list and all Meres says of Oxford in Comedy is, "so the best for comedy among us be Edward, Earl of Oxford, Doctor Gager of Oxford, Martin Rowley, once a rare scholar of learned Pembroke Hall in Cambridge, Master Edwardes of Her Majesty's Chapel, eloquent and witty John Lilly (Lyly), Lodge, Gascoine, Greene, Shakespeare," and several others. That this entitled the Oxfordians to claim Shakespeare, herein embraced in the list, is staggering to one's intelligence.

Let us glance at a few samples of Oxford's verse. Mr. J. Thomas Looney, in 1921, published "The Poems of Edward De Vere." Of those which bear the signature of "Earle of Oxorde" or "Oxenforde" or "E.O." one word only expresses them to my mind, and that is "mediocre." But the reader shall judge for himself. Take this example of two verses of bathos (there are six in all), addressed to Elizabeth as Cynthia:

"What cunning can express
The favour of her face?
To whom in this distress
I do appeal for grace.
A thousand Cupids fly
About her gentle eye.

Fair Cynthia's silver light,
That beats on running streams,
Compares not with her white,
Whose hairs are all sun-beams;
So bright my Nymph doth shine,
As day unto mine eyne."

If anyone can make sense of that last verse it is more than I can.
Now take this tinkly bit of rhyme:

"I went abroad to take the air
And in the meads I met a knight,
Clad in carnation colour fair;
I did salute this gentle wight
Of him I did his name inquire,
He sighed and said it was Desire."

Another set of verses are gloomy and complaining, innocent of one big thought, as their titles convey: "Loss of Good Name," "Revenge of Wrong," "Love and Antagonism," "The Forsaken Man," "Care and Disappointment," "Love is a Discord," the output of a disillusioned man who was born with a golden spoon in his mouth. Here is a sample:

"I am not as I seem to be,
For when I smile I am not glad;
A thrall, although you count me free,
I, most in mirth, most pensive sad,
I smile to shade my bitter spite
As Hannibal that saw in sight
His country soil with Carthage town,
By Roman force defacéd down."

I shall not weary the reader with more extracts of this very ingenuous type of verse, nor discuss the poems signed "Ignoto" in "England's Helicon," for there is no proof whatever of Oxford's connection with them; nor the lyrics in Lyly's plays which the Oxfordians claim without evidence to have been written by Oxford. We are therefore left with a few poems of the nature quoted and with passing allusions to Oxford as a poet of the Court, among Nobles and Gentlemen. His effusions might be praiseworthy of a noble who tried his hand at poetry but when we are asked to believe that the same hand composed the Shakespeare plays and poems it takes us from the superb to the ridiculous.

The damning case against the Oxfordian pretensions apart from what has been set out here may be briefly stated. Oxford died in 1604, and the first Folio of Shakespeare was published in 1623, nineteen years later. The Oxfordians pretend that they were "probably" discovered in a room of Brook House, when it passed into others hands. Again sheer guesswork! If, as they argue, that Oxford was paid £1,000 per annum by the Queen for writing the Shakespeare plays to stimulate patriotism—incidentally so foreign to her temperament or policy—they should have been preserved in the Record Office. If in 1604 they had been mislaid until nineteen years later, why were fifteen entirely new, published for the first time? How is it that *Othello* was first published in 1622 as a Quarto and in the following year was included in the Folio *with 160 new lines added and important emendations to the text*?

The feebleness of their case is seen in the way they tamper with names. They take LABEO, discard the first letter leaving ABEO; they then reverse the first two letters to get BA (con) and EO, which they say shows the plays were the joint work of Bacon and Oxford! They arbitrarily select names like *Romeo*, *Oberon*, *Othello*, *Prospero*, wherever they find the vowels E and O, and make play with these vowels as indicating OEO representing Oxenford! Finally, when in a dilemma about the lapse of those nineteen years they conjure up an unknown syndicate of noblemen who combined to complete the plays, and that Lady Pembroke was the leading individual who backed the publication of the first Folio. Like all the rest of their case it is sheer guesswork and an insult to the intelligence of the public.

Last but not least there is the question of the Bacon ciphers running through the plays and his own works. There is no doubt about their existence and if the Oxfordians imagine they can be ignored, again they reveal their lack of realism.

Surely it is time this bubble was burst. As matters stand they seem to stand together as irregulars from the Stratfordian camp, whose sole object is to snipe at the Baconian belief. Let them snipe! They never hit the mark!

An Acrostic Verse SIR FRANCIS BACON

Shake-speare,—men read thy works, and give to village clod
In ignorance the meed that is thine own,
Refusing still that thou shouldst reign as god.

For lies die hard, and truth so long delayed,
Revealed at last—by many mouths denied
As royal form in motley garb arrayed
Neglected and forsworn—still words thy secrets hide.
Courtier, statesman, chivalrous and good,
In all thy ways thou walkedst kind indeed
Save in the name, the truth not understood

But by the few; then such thy heart's deep need,
As Queen's own son, the throne thy lawful right,
Concealed thy claim, as casket holds the gem,
Only th'enshrining words men's minds delight,
Not dreaming thou should wear king's diadem!

EDITH M. DUNNE.

Gt. Crosby
March, 1947.

BACON AND "THE TEMPEST" AND "MACBETH"

By W. G. C. GUNDRY

"It may be my reverence for the primitive time carries me too far, but the truth is in some of these fables, as well as in the very frame and texture of the story as in the propriety of *names* by which the persons that figure in it are distinguished, I find a conformity and connection with the thing signified, so close and so evident, that one cannot help believing such a signification to have been designed and meditated from the first, and purposely shadowed out:" and further:—"Then again there is a conformity and significance in the very *names* which must be clear to everybody."

Bacon's Preface to *De Sapientia Veterum*.

AMONG the King's Pictures exhibited at Burlington House this year is one by Jan Gossaert (called Mabuse) depicting the children of Christian II of Denmark: one of these children, Christina, was sought in marriage by Henry VIII, but married *Francesco* Maria Sforza, Duke of Milan, and after his death, *Francis*, Duke of Lorraine. She was the subject of Holbein's portrait in the National Gallery.

Was Bacon acquainted with this picture? It seems likely as it was in the royal collection in his day, being among the pictures of Henry VIII, and from Hampton Court Palace. Lord Arundel, at whose house Bacon died at Highgate, was the greatest connoisseur of his age in the matter of pictures and he it was who advised Prince Henry, son of James I, in making his youthful collection, which subsequently formed part of the fine collection of Charles I.

The picture in question was sold by the Commonwealth and was probably re-purchased at the time of the Restoration. It is number 14 in the exhibition at Burlington House. It may not be without significance when considering Prospero's connection with Milan and Bacon's Christian name, that the first Duke of Milan of the Sforza Dynasty was named *Francis*: he died in 1466.

The following is extracted from "*Hidden Allusions in Shakespeare's Plays*" by Eva Turner Clark, pp. 588-9 (Printed in the United States of America by the Stratford Press Inc., New York, 1931).

"Shortly after Henry II's death, Catharine (de Medici) in her dejection at the loss of her husband, the incapacity of her eldest son (Francis II, whose young Queen was Mary Stuart), and the unquiet state of the Kingdom . . . under the intolerant rule of the Guises (Uncles of Mary Stuart; they controlled the

government during the short reign of Francis II), went to her Château of Chaumont to consult her astrologer, Ruggieri, who had long lived there in a set of apartments in one of the towers of the castle, as to the future of herself and her sons.

"This strange 'Vision of the future Kings of France' is told by Nicholas Pasquier, son of a member of the States-General. Ruggieri told the Queen-Mother to gaze steadily into a large mirror which hung on the wall; there he told her she would see the future Kings of France appear in succession and that each of them would reign as many years as his apparition in the mirror would make complete turns. With trepidation she did as she was directed.

"First there appeared a pale and sickly youth whom she recognised as her son Francis II, who slowly made one turn and then faded from her view.

"Next came her son Charles, who as Catharine breathlessly watched, made thirteen turns and passed out of sight. He was followed by her son Henry, who rapidly made fifteen turns and then suddenly vanished. Then entered on the scene Henry of Navarre, who, as Catharine (now unable to remove her gaze from the strange pageant) watched as one spellbound, made twenty turns, and likewise suddenly disappeared. Following him came a bright boy (Louis XIII), who continued turning again and again until, when he had done so thirty times, Catharine in an agony cried out that she could look no more, and fainted away. So at least runs the legend."

It seems not unlikely that Francis Bacon may have heard this story while at the Court of France in the train of Sir Amyas Paulett.

Mr. W. F. C. Wigston in *BACONIANA* (October 1908) gives an account of a device performed before King James I which also may have some connection with the play of *Macbeth*.

The article is entitled "*The Origin of the Witches in Macbeth*" and the passage runs as follows:—

"In the year 1605, King James I paid a visit to Oxford, and was entertained there by the students of the University. This visit is described in a Latin work entitled; '*Rex Platonicus; sive de Potentiss. Iacobo Regis ad Academ. Oxon Adventu. Anno Dom. 1605* (published. Oxon 1607. See Bodleian 4to L.37. art) which was written by Sir Isaac Wake, and a passage in this work is supposed, according to Anthony Wood in his '*Athenae Oxoniensis*,' to have given rise, or suggested, the subject of *Macbeth*. It is referred to by Farmer, and later annotators of Shakespeare, particularly by Malone, in his edition of the Plays (1790, vol. iv. 436). The play of *Macbeth*, it is stated did not appear till the year following the first edition of Wakes' '*Rex Platonicus*.'

"The passage cited, from Wood's '*Athenae Oxoniensis*'

described a device performed by the students of St. John's College, Oxford, in which three young men, dressed as sibyls, or witches, greeted King James I after the same fashion, and with the same manner of prophecy, as Macbeth and Banquo are greeted by the three sisters in the play, which appeared 'the year following the first edition of that work' (*Athenae Oxon.*, Vol. ii. 541)."

Mr. Wigston writes that Sir Isaac Wake was the son of John Wake by Christian, daughter of Sir William Wigston (Knight) of Wolston, Warwickshire.

He was Public Orator of the University of Oxford and "took part in the reception of King James, delivering an oration 'at the Hall stairs foot in Christ Church,'¹ so he describes what he actually saw or was acquainted with at first hand."

Thus there are two possible sources for the witches' scene in *Macbeth*.

As we go to press we have received a new contribution to *Folio Lore* from the busy pen of Mr. Edward D. Johnson, entitled "Shakespearean Acrostics."

It represents the collected fruits of some years' diligent labour in the field of marginal acrostics in the great folio of 1623. They are both curious and instructive, and one cannot help remembering a remark made by Ben Jonson in his memorial notes on men and matters, 1641, where speaking of Lord St. Alban, last paragraph of page 101, he says "His language (where he could spare or pass by a jest) was nobly censorious. . . The Author of the Shakespeare plays was also unable to spare or pass by a jest as may be seen by the occasional marginal acrostics such as 'wit' or in other words 'a joke.' It is curious to note how partial both Bacon and Shakespeare were to puns and other witticisms."

All the Acrostics discovered by Mr. Johnson are listed alphabetically at the beginning of the book.

We are much indebted to Mr. Johnson for this excellent publication. The Book may be obtained through the Bacon Society (Inc.).

¹ Nichol's Progresses of James I.

THE DATE OF THE SONNETS

By R. L. EAGLE

IT is true, as Mr. Dodd so ably demonstrates, that there is an absence of contemporary allusion to the Shakespeare Sonnets. No comments upon them appeared, and no further edition followed the 1609 quarto until 1640. But are we, for this reason, justified in assuming that no such quarto was published at that time, and that what has quite reasonably and naturally been taken as the date is merely a number—though what else this number can represent does not appear to have been stated? Can it really be a coincidence that on 20th May, 1609, there was entered on the Stationers Register:

“Thomas Thorpe entered for his copie under the handes of master Wilson and master Lowndes warden, a Booke called Shakespeare’s sonnettes,”

and that a book called “Shake-speare’s Sonnets” exists bearing the initials “T.T.” as the publisher, both on the title-page, and at the foot of the dedication?¹ The title-page, bearing the date 1609, is a typical production of Eld’s printing-shop.

It is also suggested (for there is no alternative way of dealing with the evidence) that Alleyn’s memorandum that he bought a copy of the Sonnets for 5d, entering this at the end of other payments applying to that year, is a forgery. It was not until the muniments at Dulwich were catalogued by George F. Warner in 1881, that it could be proved that any item on this sheet related to 1609. The odds were hundreds to one against Payne Collier, or any other forger, chancing on this particular sheet of paper. Warner eliminated Collier’s forgeries from the Dulwich manuscripts, and most of them had previously been detected by Dr. C. M. Ingleby in his *Complete View of the Shakspeare Controversy* (1861). If this entry be a forgery, it is the only clever one Collier achieved! No suspicion has been attached to this item. The correctness of the price of 5d entered is confirmed by the symbol “5d” written in a contemporary hand on the copy of the quarto at the Rylands Library, Manchester.

The fact that the Sonnets were not reprinted is *not* evidence that they were not published in 1609, nor can any particular significance be attached to that fact, except that they did not meet with sufficient popularity. Ninety percent of the Sonnet literature in England appeared between 1590 and 1597. Of the many books of Sonnets during that vogue I have only found that Daniel’s *Delia* (1592 and 1594) and Drayton’s *Idea* (1594) reached a second edition. Drayton’s went to three editions after 1594, but they were not reprints. They

¹There are several books of the period with dedications bearing publisher’s initials. Spenser’s *Amoretti* (1595) is an example. It is signed “W.P.” (William Ponsonby).

were augmented editions. Yet the sonnets of all those poets—Watson, Giles Fletcher, Lodge, William Percy, Barnfield, Griffin, William Smith, Robert Tofte and others—were not involved as are Shakespeare's verses. Few people to-day, who are quite familiar with the plays and enjoy them, read the Sonnets, for the very good reason that they find them too difficult to grasp. There was no "reading public" for Shakespeare. Sixteen of the plays were not published until 1623. Some of the plays printed previously in quarto failed, like the Sonnets to reach later editions before 1623. These were:

Love's Labour's Lost	1598
Merchant of Venice	1600
Midsummer Night's Dream	1600
2 Henry IV	1600
Much Ado	1600
Troilus and Cressida	1609
King Lear	1608

So far as I know there are no contemporary allusions to these quartos. Only about 500 copies of the Folio were printed, and nine years elapsed before there was a reprint. The third Folio appeared in 1664, and the fourth in 1685—about 2000 copies in total in 62 years! There was, as I have said, no "reading public" for Shakespeare, and it is not surprising that there was only one edition of the Sonnets.

Shakespeare's allusions to his wrinkled age must not be used as evidence that the sonnets containing such references were written by an old man. Daniel was only twenty-nine when he wrote:

"My years draw on my everlasting night . . . my days are done."

"Whilst age upon my wasted body steals."

Barnfield was not more than twenty when he exclaimed:

"Behold my gray hair, full of silver hairs,
My wrinkled skin, deep furrows in my face!"

"Why is my summer season almost done?
My spring-time past, and age's autumn gone?"

Drayton was thirty when he published:

"Looking into the glass of my youth's miseries,
I see the ugly face of my deformed cares,
With withered brows, all wrinkled with despairs."
"Age rules my lines with wrinkles in my face."

Why was it that such lamentations about the effects of time on the features of these young poets became a commonplace subject in their sonnets? I suggest that it was the influence of Petrarch (see the "Laura" sonnets 81 and 143). I will not quote the Italian, but a translation reads, "My faithful glass often shows me my weary spirit and my wrinkled skin, and my decaying wit and strength." Why should Shakespeare be considered to have been old when he



S H A K E - S P E A R E S,
S O N N E T S.

From fairest creatures we desire increase,
That thereby beauties *Rose* might neuer die,
But as the ripper should by time decease,
His tender heire might beare his memory:
But thou contracted to thine owne bright eyes,
Feed'st thy lights flame with selfe substantiall fwell,
Making a famine where aboundance lies,
Thy selfe thy soe, to thy sweet selfe too cruell:
Thou that art now the worlds fresh ornament,
And only herauld to the gaudy spring,
Within thine owne bud buriest thy content,
And tender chorle mak'st wast in niggarding:
Pitty the world, or else this glutton be,
To eate the worlds due, by the graue and thee.

2

VVhen fortie Winters shall beseige thy brew,
And digge deep trenches in thy beauties field,
Thy youthes proud livery so gaz'd on now,
Wil be a totter'd weed of smal worth held:
Then being askt, where all thy beautie lies,
Where all the treasure of thy lusty daies;
To say within thine owne deepe sunken eyes,
Were an all-eating shame, and thriftlesse praise.
How much more praise deseru'd thy beauties vse,
If thou couldst answer this faire child of mine
Shall sum my count, and make my old excuse
Proouing his beautie by succession thine.

B

This



HISTRIO-MASTIX.

Actus primi Scena prima.

Not good

Enter Peace, Grammar, Logick, Rhetorick, Arithmetick, Geometrie, Musick, and Astronomie.

Peace. V Nmaske thy face thou minister of Time
Looke forth bright mirror, let thy golded hand,
Ride (with distinstlesse motion) on the eyes
Of this sayre Chorus, till the Raigne of *Peace*,
Hath propagated *Plenty*, and increase.
Now sit wee high (tryumphant in our sway,)
Encircled with the seauen-fold flower of Art,
To tread on Barbarisme with siluer feete;
These, these are adiuncts fit to waite on *Peace*,
Who beeing courted by most searching spirits,
Haue alwayes borne themselues in God-like state,
With lofty foreheads, higher then the starres.
Draw neere sayre Daughters of eternity.
Your Fosteresse *Peace*, is (like the aged Nurffe)
Growne proud to see her Children flourish thus.

Gram. We know not how to turne these bounties backe,
But with continuance of obsequious loue,
Whil't *Peace* tryumphes, it lyes in *Grammers* might,
To make the rudest braine both speake and write.

Log. Logick shall furnish them with Argument,
And make them apt and able to dispute;
The theme shall be of *Peace*, and her sweet name,
And every *Sillogism* shall proue her fame.

A 3

Rhe.

wrote thus, and not his contemporaries when they wrote similarly?

The sonnets which Mr. Dodd attributes to the time, or after, of Bacon's fall in 1621 are appropriate to his experiences connected with the trial and death of Essex.¹ The "suborn'd informer" was "Shakespeare" himself, for an "informer" was one who informed against, or prosecuted, in any of the Queen's or King's courts—one whose business it was to lay information against a penal offender. Bacon had the painful experience of being an "informer" in the prosecution of Essex, and it was the more grievous to him because he was *forced* to take a part in it.

I agree with Mr. Dodd that there is abundant proof that John Benson's volume of 1640 was based upon the 1609 quarto, even though the order is different and eight of the sonnets are omitted by him. There are many mistakes affecting the sense, and eccentricities of spelling, repeated by Benson. These are too numerous to be attributed to chance.

Of thirty-eight misprints in 1609, Benson repeats twenty-four. Four of the thirty-eight occur in sonnets omitted by Benson. A number of the misprints of 1609 were, however, corrected by Benson but, though corrections to the number of nine were made, the punctuation was left unchanged, and many old spellings were left unmodernised. Though Benson diverted strangely from Thorpe's order, there were exceptions e.g., 120-125, and the sonnets printed by Benson in groups invariably follow the quarto. The 1609 quarto is somewhat capricious in the choice of thirty-six words for capital letters and italics. Such words as "Alchemy," "Audit," and "Autumn," occur in the quarto without, as well as with, italics. No system was followed. But Benson prints thirty-three of these words in the same way. It is apparent from his preface that he thought the quarto had Shakespeare's authority,—that "the Authour himselfe then living avouched."

In BACONIANA (Oct. 1946, p. 163) Mr. Dodd alludes to the 1640 edition as "issued by someone named John Benson," as if the identity of Benson were a mystery, or that he was a mythical person. He was one of the best known publishers between 1635 and 1640 as can be seen from Arber's *Transcript of the Stationers Registers* (5 vols. 1876). He entered the 1640 edition on 4th November, 1639.

Mr. Dodd tells me that Eld was not the printer of the 1609 quarto which, he adds, was compiled early in 1624-5, and printed "immediately prior to 1626" (see p. 208 of *Shakespeare's Sonnet-Diary*, 10th edn.) Certainly, if that be true Eld could not have been the printer as he died of plague in 1624, and ceased business in March of 1623.

I have paid several visits to The British Museum examining books printed by Eld, particularly between 1607 and 1610, and I have been provided with ample proof that the quarto of 1609 *was* set

¹See *Notes upon some of Shakespeare's Sonnets* by Randall Davies (Cayme Press, 1937) pages 30-46.

up with the type in Eld's shop. Some of the books printed by him during that period are obtainable in facsimile, and readers can, therefore, check my contention for themselves. There are, of course, several facsimile editions of the Sonnets. Similar photographic editions have been made of these books printed by him:

The Return from Pernassus	1606
Lingua, or the Combat of the Tongue and the five Senses	1607
The Puritaine, or the Widdow of Watling Street	1607
Troylus and Cressida	1609
Histrio-mastix	1610

No printer's name appears on the title-page of the last-named, but it is set up in the same type as the others, and was "Printed for Th. Thorp." The peculiar parallel lines (the space between left *blank*) across the title-page, which are also on the title-page of the Sonnets, will be noticed. This feeble anonymous play was written about 1600. Queen Elizabeth appears at the end of the play to receive fulsome flattery as the reigning "Queene of Peace."

The identical design of the light and dark "A" device, used in the previous year on the Sonnets, also appears at the commencement of the text, as it does with the Sonnets. I have been able to trace this design as being used by other printers, viz., Valentine Simmes on *Richard II* (1597), *Richard III* (1597) and *2 Henry IV* among other books. In 1603 it was on the pirated and corrupt *Hamlet* without a printer's name. About 1609 it was in Eld's possession and the last I can trace of it is on Ed Grimeston's translation of *The Heroyk Life and Deplorable Death of King Henry IV of France*, by Pierre Matthieu, printed by Eld, 1612. Among the distinguishing marks of Eld's work (he was not a good printer) I would particularly draw attention to the two totally different forms of italic capitals. One alphabet was plain, and the other ornamental. Let us take the capital "A." If we turn to Sonnet 4 or 53, and examine the italic capital used in "Audit" and "Adonis," the ornamental form will be observed. It is nothing like the italic "A" in "Alien" (S.78) and "Audite" (S.126). These two different forms appear in all the works I have cited, and in other printed by Eld. Unfortunately, the number of different italic capitals in the Sonnets is very limited, but in plays they are plentiful as *dramatis personae* are printed in italics. Eld, however, followed no system in the use of his two alphabets, and there is no mistaking a book printed by him at this period for this and other reasons. Now, it would have been impossible for type to have been specially made in exact replica, even to the minutest details and flaw, to correspond with that formerly used by Eld. There were limits to the possibilities of human skill, and no process for reproduction in facsimile.

It sometimes happened that two booksellers were jointly concerned in a publication. Such was the case with the Sonnets. Some title-pages state that the book is "to be sold by William Apsley."

and others "to be sold by John Wright."¹ These are not fictitious names. Apsley was a freeman of the Stationers Company, and was interested in the copyrights of 2 *Henry IV* and *Much Ado* (like the Sonnets, only one quarto of each was issued). He died in 1640. Did the copyright of the Sonnets expire with him, or is it a coincidence that Benson's edition then appeared? John Wright became a Freeman in 1602. The date of his death is unknown, but he joined John Haviland in 1626.

Another example of two booksellers being equally interested in a publication occurs with Bryskett's *Discourse of Civil Life* (1606). Some title-pages carry the wording:

"London, for Edward Blount"

others read:

"London, for W. Apsley."

If we accept Mr. Dodd's thesis that the Sonnets were not printed in 1609, but in 1624-5, and were not to be sold but reserved for a few privileged persons, we must be satisfied with some very good explanation for the necessity of putting the names of two different booksellers on two differently worded title-pages, so far as the names of the booksellers are concerned. There was, surely, no purpose in putting the name of any bookseller at all if the book was for private circulation.

Eld's edition of *Troilus and Cressida* also had two distinct title-pages, and both were dated 1609.

In BACONIANA (Oct. 1946, p. 164), Mr. Dodd says:

"Now in the second impression of the Plays (1632), there is a significant poem on 'Worthy Master Shakespeare and his Poems' by a writer 'I.M.S.' Observe that it is not to his plays but to his poems. On the opening page, facing the Tempest are the following lines:

'Death may destroy
They say his body: But his verse shall live
In a less volume, but more strongly bound
Shakespeare shall breathe and speake, with Laurell crown'd
Which never fades.'"

We are thus plainly told, for the first time, that there is a smaller book a less volume of "verse" than the Play Folio, and that in this verse, "although Shakespeare be dead, he still shall 'breathe and speake'" Mr. Dodd infers that the allusion is to a volume still to be published, *viz.*, the Sonnets.

His interpretation seems to me to be somewhat strained. Are not these lines inspired by Ovid's famous Elegy (Bk. I, xv)? It was from this Elegy that Shakespeare took the two lines which he placed at the head of *Venus and Adonis*. It is this Elegy which Ben Jonson put into the mouth of Ovid Junior in the first scene of *Poetaster*, and this character is a caricature of young Francis Bacon. The last two lines are given as:

¹The *Return from Pernassus* (1606) was also "printed by G. Eld for John Wright."

Then when this body falls in funeral fire,
My name shall live, and my best part aspire.

The "best part" is, of course, the poet's book, though it is small in relation to the mortal part of the creator. That is how, I think, we are intended to read the lines of "I.M.S."¹ "Poems" do not necessarily mean rhyming verse. The original meaning was according to the Grecian derivation of the word—a thing made or created, just as the word "Poet" means "a maker." Both The New English Dictionary and The Century Dictionary give the meaning of "Poem" as a written composition in metrical form. It can be in blank verse or rhyme. Even prose can be a poem if it has imagination and poetic beauty. The same applies to "verse." The context of the lines quoted by Mr. Dodd make this clear and, speaking of Shakespeare's dramatic achievements, earlier in the poem, "I.M.S." tells how he used the stage:

To raise our ancient Sovereigns from their hearse
Make Kings his subjects by exchanging *verse*,
Enlive their pale trunks, that the present age
Joys in their joy, and trembles at their rage.

I can see no allusion to Sonnets "still to be published to the world." Does not Digges in the First Folio say of the Plays, "Ev'ry line, each *verse*, here shall revive?" I am inclined to think that "I.M.S." was borrowing from Digges:

Be sure, our Shake-speare, thou canst never die
But *crowned with Laurel* live eternally.

Such, briefly are the main objections which make it difficult to accept Mr. Dodd's interesting and thoughtful theory. We are grateful to him for the many curious sidelights he has introduced into the problem of the Shakespeare Sonnets. It is such exciting articles as Mr. Dodd's which stimulate research, and so add to our knowledge. At The British Museum I have studied nearly all the books which were printed by Eld. Some of these were not even known to me by name. I have learned about the printers and booksellers of that time, and have studied the typography of several early 17th century printers. It has been a delightful and instructive quest.

Mr. Dodd has argued ably and enthusiastically for the "liquidation" of the 1609 quarto as having been printed and published in that year in accordance with the date and names appearing on the title-page. The case for the "prosecution" could not have been more formidably presented.

It is the "British way" to allow the defence to be heard, and the jury to give the verdict. The readers compose that "jury." I cannot compete with Mr. Dodd as an advocate, and I must rely on my facts rather than eloquence and emphasis. The subject is a difficult and involved one. Further debate by "counsel" would merely add

¹His identity has never been established. I have never heard of *two* christian names at that period, and the "S" probably stands for "scripsit."

to the perplexity, and is undesirable. What we need is a summing-up by somebody who has been trained in the examination of evidence, and has a knowledge of the period and the literature of the 17th and 18th centuries. We should like to know more about printing in Shakespeare's time. Was the type, and were the head and tail-pieces manufactured in this country, or imported from the Continent and bought by the printers? Why is it, for instance, that the elaborate head-piece on the title-page of the Sonnets was used by another printer (Henry Ballard) on the title-page of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* in the previous year?¹

It is curious, as Mr. Dodd shows in the third part of his article, that the editions of the Sonnets between 1714 and 1766 should have reprinted the 1640 collection and ignored the 1609 quarto. May not the reason be that Benson's medley was not scarce like the 1609 quarto, and that those editors used the edition which was easily accessible and known to them? I do, however, beg to disagree with Mr. Dodd's emphatic statement that the quarto was "absolutely unknown" before 1766 (George Steevens' reprint). He has omitted to mention Bernard Lintott's reprint of the quarto in 1710.

This was "A Collection of Poems in Two Volumes; Being all the Miscellanies of Mr. William Shakespeare." The second volume contains the Sonnets as in 1609, with a few corrections. This edition was advertised in the "Post Boy" of 24th—27th February 1710.

Another possible reason for the preference of 18th century editors for the Benson medley was that they were attracted by the "window-dressing." I can well understand the appeal at that period of such headings as "Familiarity breeds contempt;" "Constant affection;" "Immoderate passion;" "A Lover's excuse for his long absence."

¹In my inspection of many early 17th century books for the compiling of this article, I have been puzzled by the transference of wood-blocks. I have sought the opinion of experts. Their view is that the blocks were made in Holland. They changed hands either by being sold from one printer to another, or by exchange. Transferences also took place when a printer ceased business. It has also been suggested to me that the fact of the same blocks being found both on sublime and inferior works appears to rule out any suggestion of particular import to the book itself. I have encountered a somewhat crude device of a gilly-flower used by Eld. Sometimes it appears with the initials "G.S." This device, both with and without the initials, was originally made for the printer G. Simson. It can be seen, for instance, on *The Arte of Vulgar Arithmetick* by T. Hylles, printed by G. Simson in 1600. In that year, Simson died, and his widow married Eld four years later. We can certainly account for the transference of this block.

All sorts of ingenious symbolic interpretations have been advanced as to the meaning of the light and dark "A" on several designs of head-pieces. It originated on Emblem 45 in the Emblems of Andreas Alciatus (1577 edition) where they are found on the two visible sides of a pyramid. This emblem was reproduced by Whitney in 1586 (p. 53). Both books were printed by Plantin of Leyden. The first authenticated appearance of the double "A" as a head-piece is on the Paris edition of Alciat in 1584. May it be that the letters were originally intended for the initials of Andreas Alciatus, and were retained by subsequent makers of woodcuts because of the scope given by the double "A" for elaboration and ornament?

WHERE ARE THE "SHAKESPEARE" PLAY MANUSCRIPTS?

By EDWARD D. JOHNSON

FRANCIS BACON in the First Folio of the "Shakespeare" plays tells his readers where he placed certain of his writings. This information is given in one of his ciphers which may be termed the sixth line word cipher. When planning the layout of the First Folio, he decided that each full column should contain 66 lines as 66 is double 33, 33 being the simple seal or count of the word Bacon. Looking at the number 66, he thought that it would be a good idea to insert cipher messages on the 6th lines counting either up or down the columns, but as this would not give him sufficient scope, he decided also to use the 6th lines counting up or down from the beginning or end of a scene or the entrance or exit of a character, and it will be found that this is the method that he adopted. He also used the reverse page numbers, and to show the readers that he is going to do this he numbered the last page on the Folio which should be 399, 993, the reverse of 399. He also mispaged certain of the pages to make different pages bear the same number, either true or false. The message about the manuscripts starts on the page numbered 156 in the tragedies.

The readers' attention is drawn to this page by the following: The *first* line in the second column of this page is:—

Farewell my Blessing season this in thee
and the *last* line in the second column of this page is:—

Wherein the Spirit held his wont to walke.

It will be observed that there are only two capital letters in the first line, namely F and B and only two capital letters in the second line, namely W and S. It will also be seen that the F and B and W and S are in exactly the same position on the lines. In the first line we find F plus 9 letters B plus 23 letters and in the second line W plus 9 letters S plus 23 letters. This shows a deliberate design which is confirmed as follows:—The page following this page numbered 156 in the Tragedies instead of being numbered 157 is numbered 257, 100 more than its correct number (100 being the simple seal or count of Francis Bacon).

The first words on the *first* line of the first column of this page wrongly numbered 257 are "What does this mean?" and the first words on the *last* line of the first column of this page are "Lets Follow." The words "What does this mean" and "Lets follow" are of course opposite the two lines containing the capitals F, B and W, S in the second column of the page numbered 156.

The following are the 55th, 56th, 57th, and 58th lines down the first column of the page numbered 156 in the Tragedies.

CO	Costly thy habit as thy purse can buy.
B	But not exprest in fancie; rich, not gawdie
F	For the apparell oft proclaims <i>the man</i>
AN	And they in France of the best ranck and station

Here we see the author's signature F. Bacon in the margin with the words The Man at the end of the third line.

The next page being wrongly numbered 257 counting back makes the page numbered 156 bear the number 256.

On turning to the reverse page 256 in the comedies (page numbered 48) we see that the *last* three words at the end of the 58th line down the column (the N of the above signature F. Bacon being at the beginning of the 58th lines down the 1st column of the page numbered 156 in the Tragedies) are PLACE I DID otherwise I DID PLACE. These words are at the end of the 58th line down in the second column of the reverse page 256 in the comedies and this line is the 6th line counting up the column.

On turning to the true page 256 (numbered 364) in the Tragedies, we see that the first four words at the beginning of the 6th line counting up the second column of this page are IN ALL MY WRITINGS, otherwise ALL MY WRITINGS IN.

On turning to the page numbered 256 in the Comedies—we see that the last two words on the 6th line counting up the first column of this page are A GRAVE—giving us so far the message F. Bacon, I did place, all my writings in, a Grave. The question now to be asked is: Where is the grave that Bacon is referring to? This page in the Comedies numbered 256 is the reverse page 48. On turning to the reverse page 48 in the Histories (page numbered 185) we see that the last word on the 6th line down the first column of this page is Stratford—so telling us that the grave is at Stratford. Whose grave at Stratford is Bacon referring to? The reverse page 48 in the Histories where we find the word Stratford is the page numbered 185.

On turning to the reverse page 185 in the Tragedies (page numbered 115) we see on the 6th line up the second column of this page the words "Our actors." We are thus told that the grave is our actor's. Who is the actor Bacon is referring to? On turning to the true page 185 (numbered 293) in the Tragedies, we see that the *last* word on the 6th line counting *down* from the stage direction "Enter Lear" in the first column is "Master" and that the *first* word in the 6th line counting *up* from the stage direction "Enter Lear" in the second column of this page is "Will." This page is the reverse page 107 in the Tragedies. Turning to the page numbered 107 in the Histories on the 6th line down the second column of this page we see the word "Shake." (This word "Shake" is really on the 8th line down the column, but two of the lines are printed wholly in italics and Bacon made a rule which never varies that any line which he prints wholly in italics must be omitted from the count). We thus get in sequence Master Will Shake and now require the word Spear to complete the name. Here Bacon is in a difficulty for the following reason. The word Shake is on the 6th line down in the second column of the page numbered 107 in the Histories, and this page is the true page 139 and reverse page 126. The word spear to complete the word Shakespeare must therefore appear on some 6th line on a page bearing or representing the numbers 107, 139 or 126 in either the Comedies,

Histories and Tragedies. But the word "Spear" is a difficult word to insert and yet make sense of the remainder of the text where it appears, so Bacon is forced to use the word "Spare" an anagram of Spear—to complete the word Shakespear.

On turning to the page numbered 139 in the Histories we find that in the second column of this page the first word on the 6th line up from the stage direction "Alarums to the fight" is "spare."

In case his reader has missed this reference, Bacon has placed the word "Spare" on the 6th line up the first column of the page numbered 126 in the Comedies to agree with shake on the 6th line down the second column of the reverse page 126 in the Histories.

In the 6th line up the second column of the reverse page 126 (page numbered 178) in the Comedies we find the words—"You use parts" and to show his readers what he has been doing, Bacon in the second column of the page numbered 107 in the Comedies on the 6th line up from the stage direction "Enter Benedicke alone" places the words "put it in practice—be cunning in the working this."

In the first column of the reverse page 107 (page numbered 126) in the Histories on the 6th line down from the stage direction "Enter one crying a miracle" we find the words "Saint Albones."

We thus find on these 6th lines the message, F. Bacon—I did place—all my writings in—a grave—at Stratford—our actors—Master Will Shake—spear.

The following Table shows this sequence. Here the following abbreviations are made. P=The Page Number. T.P.=The True Page Number. R.P.=The Reverse Page Number.

T.p.	156	256	(From next page)		
			1st Col.	58th line down	
				N of F	BACON
C p.	48	rp 256	2nd Col.	58th line down	
				6th line up	I DID PLACE
T		tp 256	p. 364	2nd Col. 6th line up	ALL MY WRITING
					IN
C rp	48	p. 256	1st Col.	6th line up	A GRAVE
H rp	48	p. 185	1st Col.	6th line down	AT STRATFORD
T p.	115	r 185	2nd Col.	6th line up	OUR ACTORS
T. p.	293	tp 185	1st Col.	6th line up	MASTER
T. p.	293	tp 185	rp 107	2nd Col. 6th line up	WILL
H. rp.	139	rp 126	p. 107	2nd Col. 6th line down	SHAKE
H p.	139			2nd Col. 6th line up	SPEAR
C rp.	178	p. 126		1st Col. 6th line up	SPEAR
C p.	178	rp 126	p. 107	2nd Col. 6th line up	YOU USE PARTS
				2nd Col. 6th line down	PUT IT IN
					PRACTICE
H	p 126		1st Col.	6th line up	SAINT ALBONES

In the above message—it will be seen that the words "a grave" are on the 6th line up the 1st column of page 256 (reverse page 48) in the Comedies. If we turn to the reverse page 256 (page 9) in the Histories we see that the *last five words* on the 6th line up the second column of this page are "on perill of a curse." These words are on page 9 of the Histories. Turning to the reverse page 9 (page 295) in the Comedies we find that the *first three words* on the 6th line down the

first column of this page are "I will devise." On turning to the reverse page 9 in the Tragedies (page numbered 391) we find that the *first five words* on the 6th line down the first column of this page are "so needful for this present" and that the last word on the 6th lines up this column is "adventure."

The following Table shows this sequence:—

C. p. 256	}	p. 9	2 col. 6th line up	a grave
H. rp. 256			2 col. 6th line up	on perill of a curse
C p. 295	}	rp 9	1 col. 6th line up	I will devise
T p. 391			1 col. 6th line down	so needful for this present
T. p. 391	}	rp 9	t.p. 283 1st col. 6th line up	"adventure"

The message therefore continues—a grave—on perill of a curse—I will devise—so needful for this present—adventure.

It will thus be seen that Francis Bacon tells the reader that he has placed his writings in our actor's Stratford Grave and that he devised the grave with a curse on it, which was necessary to prevent the grave being disturbed for a period of time.

As we all know, Will Shaksper's grave at Stratford had on it an inscription the last line of which is—"and curst be he that moves my bones."

The above message ends with the words "so needful for this present adventure," so we will continue from this point—as before.

C.	p.283	rp 21	}	2nd col. 6th line up	"so meet for this great errand."
T.		p.21		1st col. 6th line down	"Take my prayers with you"
H. p. 212	}	rp 21	}	2nd col. 6th line down	"You few that lov'd me."
H. p. 212				1st col. 6th line down	"Hear what I say and Then go."
C.		p.21	}	1st col. 6th line down	"You were best."
C.		p.21		1st col. 6th line up	"Receiving them from"
H rp 244	}	p.21	}	1st col. 6th line down	"Their owne ground."
C. p. 244				2nd col. 6th line down	"Certain it is that"
T.tp. 244	}	p.352	}	2nd col. 6th line up	"A Statue"
T.tp. 244				1st col. 6th line down	"we have affected"
H. p. 185	}	tp 217	}	1st col. 6th line down	"at Stratford"
T.rp. 185				2nd col. 6th line up	"our actors"
T. p. 75	}	rp.217	}	1st col. 6th line down	"To the hollow ground"
T. p. 325				1st col. 6th line up	"I'le have the worke taken out"
H. p. 50	}	rp 217	}	1st col. 6th line up	"I'le tye them in"
C. p. 256				1st col. 6th line up	"A grave"

Bacon tells his friends to meet together, to go to Stratford and remove the manuscripts which he had taken out to Stratford and placed in the grave, also that he was responsible for the statue of Will Shakespeare.

Whether Bacon's friends ever deciphered this message and removed the manuscripts deposited in Shakespeare's grave is not known and probably never will be, as the Shakespeare Trust would fight tooth and nail to prevent the grave being opened as they are afraid that something might be found which would mean the end of Stratford as the shrine of the author of the plays. From the words Ile tye them

in a grave—the message continues—Ile tye them in a grave—all that I have brought—Tis certain—our monuments hang in the air—in their embracement—an unknown actor. Look for the secret, it will come to pass—open again—these Stratford graves—you shall be that perceive him—a subtle orator and do not doubt. This Philosopher—that hopes to rise again—hath brought to light, a mysterie and I Bacon, usurp the name of Shak-spur. You shall by this perceive him—doe this—take down again—our monuments, for they are mortized and adjoined—through a secret grate of Iron Barres—which when it falls—the place doth contain my bookes. Read this, how farre your eyes may pierce I cannot tell Bacon.

There are dozens of these messages on the sixth lines, all of which the writer has worked out, but it is hoped that sufficient has been shown to demonstrate Francis Bacon's sixth line word cipher.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE FIRST FOLIO.

Sir,

A certain literary critic, who is a Stratfordian, has written to me, to say that the signatures which I show in my book "The Mystery of the First Folio" are all bunk—the product of my imagination and my own invention, also that the mis-pagnations in the First Folio are simply printers' errors and were not made deliberately. Stratfordians have tried to make out that the First Folio contains over 20,000 errors, and that it was the worst printed book that was ever issued from the press. They are referring to the greatest book in the world with the exception of the authorised version of the Bible. They are wrong because the First Folio contains very few printers' errors, the so-called errors were necessary because Francis Bacon was using this book to convey to his readers certain cipher messages, so that readers in the future could recognise his mind although disguised under the pseudonym of "William Shakespeare".

The First Folio was printed by Isaac Jaggard, who had a great reputation as a printer. All the great Elizabethan printers took a pride in the manner in which their work was turned out. Jaggard would never have permitted the First Folio to be issued full of errors unless it had been so intentionally printed according to the instructions of the author. In an Emblem Book dated 1616, there are two pictures, depicting the inside of a printer's workshop, showing a man wearing a hat similar to that shown in Bacon's portraits standing beside the compositor and apparently giving him instructions as to the setting up of the type.

In "The two books of Francis Bacon of the proficiency and advancement of Learning" published by Henrie Tomes in 1605, the leaves and not the pages are numbered, and in the second book the leaves after 70 are numbered as follows, 70, 71, 70, 72, 74, 73, 74, 75, 69, 77, 78, 79, 80, 77, 74, 69, 69, 82, 87, 79, 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 99, 97, 99, 94, 100, 99, 102, 103, 93, 106. How is it possible that this extraordinary mispagnation could have escaped the observation of (1) The Compositor (2) the printer (3) the printer's reader and (4) the author. There must have been some design in this mispagnation which has not yet been revealed. Thus the phenomenon we observe in the First Folio was anticipated in "The Proficiency and Advancement of Learning" and the question inevitably suggests itself whether there was not a similar reason for both. Every mispagnation in the First Folio is intentional and forms part of a design to leave to posterity certain data by which Francis Bacon's connection with the publication of the First Folio can be revealed to discerning Readers.

Yours faithfully,

The Editor, BACONIANA.

EDWARD D. JOHNSON.

To the Editor of BACONIANA.

Sir,

THE MOTH AND THE CANDLE

Many of your readers have probably noticed the misinterpretation of the emblem facing page 22 of January BACONIANA, reproduced from Gabriell Rollenhagen's emblems (1611).

The insect flying towards the flame of the candle is not, of course, intended for a bee which is not attracted by a light or flame to its own destruction. This is a peculiarity of moths and other insects which fly at dusk or by night. This "suicidal" instinct has always been a favourite for illustration and example in fable, parable, emblem from ancient Greek to the present-day. Among the emblem books in which it is featured are:

Corrozet	1540
Giovio and Symeoni	1561
Paradin	1562
Boisard and Messin	1588
Camerarius	1596
Vaenius	1608
Whitney	1581

As in most of these emblems the insect is to be found in the same position and distance with regard to the candle's flame, it would appear that designers of emblems were plagiarists. It could not be mere chance that the candle-stick in Giovio and Paradin is the same—consisting of an armless female with her legs twisted around each other like a corkscrew. The emblem of Rollenhagen's book points to the fact that uncontrolled love leads to bitterness and ruin. So it does in Vaenius (*Emblems of Love*) and Symeoni (*Imprese*).

If Mr. Franco will turn to Whitney's *Emblems* (1581) p. 219, he will again find the centre-piece is a lighted candle on a table. Flying insects are approaching the flame. The emblem is headed "*In amore tormentum*" which are the identical words of the motto for Rollenhagen's emblem.

Shakespeare uses the illustration of the candle and moth in *Merchant of Venice* (ii-9):

Thus hath the candle signed the moth.
O, these deliberate fools!

Those who possess Green's *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* should turn to pages 151-153.

Yours faithfully,

PROSPERO.

To the Editor of BACONIANA.

Sir,

MRS. GALLUP AND THE CONCLUSION OF THE NEW ATLANTIS

In answer to the implied queries in the article by Mr. Eagle and Mr. Gundry in the October BACONIANA, I may say that I know that when Mrs. Gallup was working for the late Col. George Fabyan at "Riverbank" Geneva, Illinois, she found and deciphered, by the Bi-Literal Cipher, the conclusion of the *New Atlantis*. As I was the one who first interested Col. Fabyan in the Baconian theory and the Ciphers, I was in close touch with the work at Riverbank. Whether this decipher was ever published is doubtful, though I know Col. Fabyan intended to do so. After the death of Mrs. Fabyan all Col. Fabyan's Books and Manuscripts were presented to the Library of Congress Washington D.C. I am now trying to find out if this decoded manuscript is there and what would be necessary to gain permission for its publication.

Cordially,

KATE H. PRESCOTT.

563 West Central Street,
Franklin, Massachusetts.

To the Editor of BACONIANA.

Sir,

BACON AND DE VERE, OXFORD

As I was on the "Brains Trust" when the rival claims of Bacon and Oxford were discussed, perhaps you will allow me a few words.

I said, not that there was no contemporary reference to Bacon as a *Post* but as a *Playwright*—like the one, for example, which Meres gives, "The best for comedy among us be Edward Earl of Oxford." As there was an open discussion, it would interest me to know why this was not at once challenged—and answered. There is still time to reply in these columns.

I also said that the Shakespeare plays were "full of love"—and on this point I can read the plays for myself and require no other authority. However, before me is a little work published by Nimmo in 1875. Its title page is,

CUPID'S / BIRTHDAY BOOK / ONE
THOUSAND LOVE DARTS FROM / SHAKE-
SPEARE, / GATHERED AND ARRANGED FOR
EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR, / BY GEO.
JOHNSTON.

On the page facing the Title Page is "Let what is here contain'd relish of love," Cymbeline, iii, 2. On the Title Page is, "Of this matter Is little Cupid's crafty arrow made," Much Ado About Nothing, iii, 1. As your Baconian experts claim, there is very little of love in the Plays, perhaps they would be good enough to tell us how Mr. Johnston managed to extract 1000 "love" darts from them?

Just one word more, BACONIANA has always been held in high regard by me, and I am therefore very sorry to see it descending to the well known Stratfordian level of attacking personalities instead of arguments. I have always resented the contemptible way in which the character of Bacon was assailed when your arguments were found to be unanswerable—and now that you are discovering in Edward de Vere a formidable rival to Bacon, you are quickly learning how to deal with him in typical Stratfordian ways.

Sincerely yours,

1, Temple Fortune Lane,
N.W.11.

H. CUTNER.

(If Mr. Cutner can derive any satisfaction because the Shakespeare plays contain 1,000 "love darts" from them, he might first reflect that there are over 100,000 lines in the Plays, giving the "love" interest approximately 1 per cent of space. Moreover, the fact remains that love as a true and lasting sentiment is lacking, for with rare exceptions it is presented either as a disaster or as a subject for ridicule. But that Mr. Cutner uses allusions to love as some sort of evidence that Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, wrote the plays can only be attributed to ignorance of that worthless peer's career. Intrigues entered into it, yes, but not love. So far from regarding Oxford as a formidable rival to Bacon—or a rival at all—the article elsewhere in this issue may convince our correspondent of our measured opinions of this fairly obvious literary hoax.—Editor)

To the Editor of BACONIANA.

Sir,

SIR NICHOLAS BACON AS FOSTER-PARENT OF FRANCIS

In BACONIANA for April, 1946 (page 83) there appears a letter from Mr. R. L. Eagle quoting an English version of an Experiment in *Sylva Sylvarum* relating to "passages of sympathy between persons of near blood," and relating a dream which Bacon had at the time of the death of Sir Nicholas Bacon. Mr. Eagle asks, "Would he have had this dream if Sir Nicholas had been a foster parent and therefore not of near blood?" Let us see the *Sylva*; Bacon writes: "I would have it first thoroughly inquired into whether there be any secret passages of sympathy between persons of near blood; as parents, children, brothers, sisters, nurse-children, husbands, wives, etc. There be many reports in history"

He then proceeds to give the account of the dream which he had when in Paris. The English version quoted by Mr. Eagle uses the words, "my father," where the Latin has "*pater viveret Londinii*," and "two or three days before my father's death" where the Latin is "*duos tresve ante ejus obitum dies*," and lastly, where Mr. Eagle quotes, "my father's house in the country," the Latin has "*sedes nostras ruri setas* . . ." that is to say, *our* house in the country."

Note "nurse-children," "(the) father," and "our house." This should be a sufficient answer to Mr. Eagle's request for an explanation.

If Dr. Rawley was the translator of the version quoted by Mr. Eagle, it may be that he was ignorant that there was a secret, or that he was taking care to conceal it. The matter is worthy to be "thoroughly inquired into."

Yours etc.,

M. SENNETT.

9, Ashchurch Grove,
London, W.12.

To the Editor of BACONIANA.

Sir,

With reference to the article by A. Metaphor in the January BACONIANA, to the line in Sonnet 76 "Why write I still all one, *ever the same*" and Queen Elizabeth's motto, *Semper Eadem*, I beg to point out that the motto of the City of LEICESTER is *Semper Eadem*. The origin of the City's motto is unknown, but two Charters were granted to the City by Elizabeth in 1589 and 1599 without mention of the City Arms.

Yours faithfully,

2, North Park Grove,
Leeds 8.

W. H. UNDERWOOD.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

BACON AND COKE.

R. L. Stevenson has insisted that a good reader must start with the admission that he is not always right, and this can apply to a listener also. I have listened with pleasure to the weekly broadcasts *Great Figures of the Bar*, but I was rather surprised to notice that the speaker when dealing with the great lawyer Sir Edward Coke, referred to him as a kindly and virtuous man, while at the same time referring to Coke's great contemporary and rival, Sir Francis Bacon, as a corrupt judge, servile and mean of soul. More recent light, however, has been thrown on the lives of these two men, showing Coke, although a great lawyer, to have been coarse, narrow-minded and venomous and utterly unscrupulous, whereas Bacon is shown as Coke's antithesis. The old view, which most of us were taught in school, was founded on Macaulay's famous essay on Bacon, but Macaulay's view has been proved quite wrong. In fact, in Bachelor's *Life of Bacon* mention is made that Macaulay admitted he had made a mistake and expressed regret he had ever written his Bacon essay. His best biographer, J. Cotter Morrison, wrote "nothing has been more injurious to Macaulay's fame than this essay He deviated into fiction in his libel on Bacon." Hallam, the historian, described Bacon as "the greatest and wisest of mankind." A book recently published, *The Martyrdom of Francis Bacon*, by Alfred Dodd, proves conclusively that Bacon was a greatly-wronged and misjudged man and was not guilty of corruption, whereas Coke was proved guilty of corruption, dismissed from all his high offices, and disgraced. Bacon, on the other hand, though after his fall not restored to his high office, was restored to the King's favour and in fact enjoyed a State pension so long as he lived of over £1,000 a year, equivalent to about £4,000 to £5,000 in our times.

"BACONIAN" (Johnsonville).

(The above letter, written by a member of the Bacon Society, first appeared in the New Zealand *Listener*, and is published here because the writer draws attention to Bachelor's *Life of Bacon* wherein it is stated that Macaulay regretted he had written the scurrilous Bacon essay.—Ed.)

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

The new clues for Bacon's authorship in *Love's Labour's Lost*, discovered by Mr. James Arther and published in the January issue of BACONIANA are a valuable contribution to our Shakespearean researches. A real, not imaginary ciphered message has two essential qualities. First, it is concealed; secondly, as soon as it is correctly decoded, it becomes plain as way to parish church; it is obvious and unassailable; any attempts to refute it result only in strengthening it. The messages discovered by Mr. Arther are unexpected and may well be pronounced quite superfluous in view of all the other ciphers also signaling Bacon's authorship. Yet it is quite consistent with Bacon's love of cryptography to add these superabundant and delightful wares of cunning to the text of the play and the ciphers analysed by the late Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, Mr. Edward Johnson, and other Baconian commentators. It was Bacon's hobby, and Mr. Arther is warmly to be congratulated for his brilliant revelations.

And yet there is still more in the text of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

On page 125 of the First Folio we read: *Finis Actus Primus* and on the next page, *Actus Secunda*. Could the Editors and the readers of BACONIANA suggest the meaning of the atrocious Latin absurdities? It is also perfectly plain.

P. S. POROHOVSHIKOV.

Atlanta, Georgia.

To the Editor of BACONIANA

Sir,

In January BACONIANA, page 29, "A Plea for Unity" you give the anagram from the last two lines of Sonnet 109; there is a mistake in the spelling of Southampton, in *this case* it is spelt with *t* not *pt*. In making that "powerful rhyme" from his, and his great friends name, Bacon had no use for a *p*, but he needed six *t*'s, so he substituted *t* in place of *p* making the spelling Southamttton.

May I draw your attention to something I do not happen to have seen mentioned in anything I have had from the Bacon Society, that is, Sonnet 126 has only twelve lines, as it is printed to-day, but in the original edition dated 1609, the thirteenth and fourteenth lines are given by open brackets, to be filled in by someone at sometime; the anagram, from the last two lines of Sonnet 109, just fills those brackets, the Sonnet then reads—

"O thou, my lovely boy, who in thy power
Dost hold Time's fickle glass, his sickle hour
Who hast be waning grown, therein show'st;
Thy lovers withering; as thy sweet self grow'st;
If Nature, (sovereign mistress over wrack)
As thou goest onwards, still will pluck thee back,
She keeps thee to this purpose, that her skill
May time disgrace, and wretched minutes kill.
Yet fear her, O thou minion of her pleasure!
She may detain, but still not keep her treasure:
Her audite, though delay'd, answered must be,
And her quietus is to render thee.
(I Francis Verulam to his loving dualitie)
(Henry Wriothesley Southamttton)."

This seems to be the audite answered and the final settlement (quietus) of the question, by whom, and to whom, are the Sonnets written.

"Showing their birth and where they did proceed?"—(Sonnet 76)

Yours sincerely,

Sheringham, Norfolk.

R. M. EMERSON (MRS.)

Note.—Mrs. Emerson has apparently not read Mr. Alfred Dodd's edition of The Sonnets. The missing lines referred to are there given, but they are not doggerel, being metrical rhyming and harmonious.—Editor.

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

A WORD ON ANAGRAMS

On page 29 of January BACONIANA, Mrs. R. M. Emerson presents your readers with an anagram constructed out of the last two lines of Shakespeare's sonnet number 109 *viz*:—

"For nothing this wide universe I call"

"save thou, my Rose; in it thou art my All."

These lines Mrs. Emerson re-arranges as follows:—

"I Francis Verulam to his loving Dualitie"

"Henry Wriothesley Southampton."

It should here be noted that there is no P in the text of the sonnet lines quoted, but there is an extra T which gives a false spelling to Soithamtton.

But this is the least fault which stultifies the anagram. It seems incredible that Francis Bacon the expert cipherist and Cabalist should have been guilty of such an elementary error. However to proceed, the anagram has worse faults than this; It is an *ungrammatical* and also an *incomplete* sentence.

Further there is no ground for a serious consideration of the statement as far as it goes. The only duality ever claimed by Francis Bacon was William Shakespeare the Dramatist, the author, his TWIN SELF? His ALTER EGO.

In order to make the anagram grammatical it should either read 'I F- V- to my dualitie, etc.' or else the initial pronoun I should be deleted. Besides this there is no sequence to complete the sentence and the sense.

The art of anagrams and cryptic or concealed writing dates back to an hoary antiquity coeval with the art of writing itself. It was practised by the ancient Hebrews, whilst Homer and the Greek tragedians were experts in the art.

The late Professor Margoliouth of Oxford has demonstrated this beyond doubt in his little book entitled, "The Homer of Aristotle." A study of this book will bring out the following points always observed by the tragic poets in the construction of the anagrams woven into the first six lines of every tragedy extant.

- (a) All the letters of the text must be used, each letter once only.
- (b) The anagram so constructed must be grammatical and metrical.
- (c) No substitution, omission, addition or repetition of letters is permissible.
- (d) The anagram gave information which the instructed reader would look for, *viz*.—dedication, identity of the author and date of production.

From a consideration of the foregoing it ensues that the opening lines of some of the tragedies are not perfect from an artistic point of view, a fact which has aroused the criticism of many classical scholars with a view to emendation of the text in the opening lines of some of the tragedies. Such emendations would in most cases not have been suggested if the critics had been aware of the cause of the artistic imperfection, *i.e.*, a concealed anagram.

Whether Francis Bacon was aware of the existence of these anagrams in the opening lines of the greek tragedians is a matter for speculation. In any case I think that he would have arranged his text by one, or other of his many devices palpable in his myriad ciphers scattered throughout the text of the great Folio of 1623. In order to give a letter perfect and grammatical message with a clear and complete sense. Mrs. Emerson's attempt is ingenious, but for the reasons stated above I submit that it cannot be regarded as anything than a meaningless jumble of words. There is a further aspect which may be noticed in passing namely that of "anachronism." If we accept the date of publication as 1609, how could Bacon describe himself as Verulam, a title he did not acquire till 1617? If on the other hand we accept Mr. Dodd's date of publication, Bacon had by then acquired the rank of Viscount with the title of St. Alban.

TOUCHSTONE.

To the Editor of BACONIANA
Sir,

BACON'S COAT-OF-ARMS

With reference to the illustration which Mr. Biddulph reproduced of Bacon's Coat-of-Arms in his article "*Francis Bacon in Emblem*" in the issue of July last of BACONIANA and Prospero's comments thereon in his letter which appeared in the April number of our Journal this year, may I be allowed to make the following observations on the points raised:—

The Coat granted to the Bacon Family is:—

"Gules, on a Chief Argent, two Mullets, Sable"

which in plain English means that the main part of the shield is red and that the upper part is silver with two black mullets thereon.

When a Coat is depicted in black and white without colours, or cut for a seal, the tinctures are depicted by means of lines or other marks.

In the case in point, vertical lines are merely needed to complete the shield: it may be that the illustrator of the exemplification in "*The Mirrour for Modestie*" was ignorant of this method of indicating the tinctures, and as a result left the shield blank.

As Prospero writes, the crescent denotes the younger line—the mark of cadency of a cadet of a family.

The absence of supporters from the shield may be explained because Bacon may not then have chosen them. Every nobleman is entitled to these, though I believe, a few families have them which have not been ennobled; this is exceptional however.

The supporters Bacon ultimately chose were Castor and Pollux.

In the bookplate in the books presented to Cambridge University by Sir Nicholas Bacon in 1574, Bacon is quartered, I think, with Quaplude. This is one of the earliest English book-plates.

Yours faithfully,

GONZALO.